Running title: Forest type effects on microbial communities

Title: Mixing coniferous and deciduous trees (*Fagus sylvatica*): Site-specific response of microorganisms in litter and soil

Authors: Jing-Zhong Lu[1*], Stefan Scheu[1,2]

[1] J. F. Blumenbach Institute of Zoology and Anthropology, University of Göttingen, Untere Karspüle 2, 37073 Göttingen, Germany

[2] Center of Biodiversity and Sustainable Land Use, University of Göttingen, Büsgenweg 1, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

[*] Corresponding author (E-mail: jlu@gwdg.de)

Keywords: Douglas-fir, Norway spruce, PLFA, soil respiration, root-derived resources, forest, ecosystem functioning

Authors contribution: SS and JZL designed the study. JZL collected the data, analyzed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. SS contributed to all stages of the manuscript.

Abstract

Coniferous and deciduous trees growing in pure and mixed forests likely shape microbial communities via the difference in the supply of litter- and root-derived resources. However, effects of forest types including non-native tree species on microbial communities and their variation with site conditions remain poorly understood. We combined physiological and community approaches, and investigated microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass and phospholipid-derived fatty acids (PLFAs) in the litter and soil at four nutrient-rich and four nutrient-poor sites in Lower Saxony, Germany. At each of the eight sites, five types of forest were studied, including pure stands of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), as well as mixed species stands of beech and spruce, and beech and Douglas-fir, i.e., 40 forest plots. Forest type only affected soil microorganisms at nutrient-poor sites, but not at nutrient-rich sites. At nutrient-poor sites, conifer pure- and mixed-forests had lower microbial basal respiration and biomass, and were more stressed compared to beech forests. The detrimental effects of Douglas-fir on microorganisms were particularly strong compared to beech in litter and in soil at nutrient-poor sites. By contrast, beech forests at nutrient-poor sites were less limited of labile carbon compounds than conifer pure- and mixed- forests, likely due to its high root-derived resources. These results indicate that long-term effects of planting exotic tree species such as Douglas-fir on ecosystem functioning need further attention in particular at nutrient-poor sites. Whereas planting Douglas-fir in pure or mixed stands at large spatial scale should be cautious, planting Douglas-fir at nutrient-rich sites appear of little concern from the perspective of microbial communities. Overall, the results highlight the potential importance of root-derived resources in determining microbial community structure and functioning, and document the sensitivity of soil microorganisms to planting non-native tree species differing in the provisioning of these resources from native species.

Highlights

* Forest type effects on microorganisms only occurred at nutrient-poor sites.

* Native European beech can stabilize microbial community structure irrespective of site conditions.

* Root-derived resources likely drive the functioning of microbial communities.

* Introduced Douglas-fir may have particularly low root-derived resources at nutrient-poor sites.

* Soil pH well explained the effects of forest type and site conditions in soil.

1. Introduction

Studying the linkage between plants and soil microorganisms bears great potential to improve our understanding of the factors that drive the microbial community composition (Balvanera et al., 2006; van der Heijden et al., 2008; Anderson and Domsch, 2010; Bardgett and van der Putten, 2014; Graham et al., 2016;). Trees as long-lived plants may affect microbial communities through several pathways, most notably by the quantity and quality of litter and root exudates (Wardle et al., 2004; Högberg and Read, 2006). These resources are likely to shape the community structure of soil microorganisms as dissimilar carbon resources favor different guilds of microorganisms (Ekblad and Nordgren, 2002; Fierer et al., 2003; Fanin et al., 2019). For example, Gram$^-$ bacteria are benefiting in particular from labile carbon compounds, whereas Gram$^+$ bacteria are adapted to use more recalcitrant carbon resources (Fierer et al., 2003; Fanin et al., 2019; Waller et al., 2020). Similarly, niches vary between fungal groups. While saprotrophic fungi are major decomposers of plant litter, mycorrhizal fungi are more abundant in deeper soil and receive carbon from plant roots (Lindahl et al., 2007; Nacke et al., 2016). Therefore, the composition of microbial communities may change in response to variations in tree species composition, associated with changes in litter quality, root-derived resources and mycorrhizal associations (L. Chen et al., 2019).

Conifer and deciduous trees growing in pure and mixed stands likely differ in the supply of resources to soil microorganisms. Accumulation of organic layer in coniferous forests has been attributed to the recalcitrance of conifer needles, but there is increasing evidence that roots and mycorrhizal fungi also affect the storage of soil carbon (Schmidt et al., 2011; Clemmensen et al., 2013; Averill et al., 2014). The importance of below-ground processes such as root exudation, and the competition of saprotrophic and mycorrhizal fungi maybe more important than litter deposition for structuring microbial communities, as the amount of litter inputs are relatively similar between mature stands of coniferous and deciduous trees (Scheu et al., 2003; Schmidt et al., 2011; Augusto et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Bluhm et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019). Further, the response of microbial communities to mixed forests is poorly understood. The mixtures of litter may improve resource availability for soil microorganisms and facilitate litter decomposition (Hättenschwiler et al., 2005; Fujii et al., 2020), although tree identity has been suggested to outweigh tree diversity as structuring forces of soil microbial communities (Scheibe et al., 2015; Dawud et al., 2016; L. Chen et al., 2019). Species mixture could also yield greater above-ground and below-ground biomass over monocultures due to positive interspecific interactions, such as interspecific facilitation and improved resource partitioning, leading to higher complementarity in space or time in mixed forests (Cardinale et al., 2007; Ma and Chen, 2016; Emmett Duffy et al., 2017). This likely also affect the role of mixed forests in shaping soil microbial communities. Overall, it remains unclear how soil microorganisms are affected by the identity and diversity of tree species, either coniferous or deciduous, single or mixed species.

Environmental context is particularly important in understanding the relations between tree species composition and microbial communities (Ratcliffe et al., 2017; X. Chen et al., 2019). However, little is known to what extent effects of tree species composition on soil microorganisms vary with site conditions such as soil type and nutritional status. Facilitation among plants is more pronounced in resource-limited environments according to the stress-gradient hypothesis, and positive interspecific interactions of plants at nutrient-poor conditions could be mediated by soil microorganisms (Defossez et al., 2011; Harpole et al., 2016; David et al., 2020). Plants do not passively tolerate environmental stress, but adapt in various ways to unfavorable growth conditions by induced plasticity (Callaway et al., 2003; de Vries et al., 2019). For example, plants generally allocate more resources to roots than above-ground biomass under nutrient-poor conditions (Kawaletz et al., 2013; Yan et al., 2016). The trade-off between resource capture and resource use could drive the change of microbial communities. Indeed, de Vries et al. (2019) recently showed that herb species change the quality rather than quantity of root exudates and induce higher microbial respiration under drought conditions, presumably facilitating nutrient capture via stimulating microorganisms. Therefore, the role of tree species composition as driver of microbial community composition and functioning may be more pronounced under nutrient-poor than nutrient-rich conditions, but this has not been investigated until today.

A better understanding of the effects of tree species composition and site conditions on soil microorganisms has important implications for forest management, especially in temperate and boreal regions where tree species richness is low and managed forests typically are dominated by only a few species (Knoke et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2009; Bauhus et al., 2010). While Norway spruce currently is the most important timber species in Central Europe, its monocultures have been severely damaged by extreme weather and the outbreak of bark beetles in recent years, and such events are predicted to occur more frequently and at higher severity in the future (Biedermann et al., 2019; Brandl et al., 2020). For reducing the risks of damage and maintaining economic gains, planting of mixed forests including non-native species such as Douglas-fir is increasingly discussed (Pretzsch et al., 2017; Ammer et al., 2018). However, the impact of planting Douglas-fir on biodiversity and functioning of forests is little studied, and this applies in particular to the belowground system, although e.g., Douglas-fir has been suggested to affect soil chemistry in a similar way than spruce (Schmid et al., 2014). Taken together, we lack a comprehensive evaluation of different forest types on the structure and functioning of soil microbial communities across nutritional gradients.

Here, we investigate the structure and functioning of microbial communities in litter and soil of five types of forests at nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites. Forest types include pure stands of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), Norway spruce (*Picea abies*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), and the mixtures of the two coniferous species with beech. European beech forms the climax tree species in lowland and lower montane

regions of Central Europe (Leuschner et al., 2017). Norway spruce originally only occurred at higher mountain ranges and boreal regions in Central Europe, but it has been planted across wide areas of Central Europe including lowlands, and today it is the most important timber species in Central Europe (Knoke et al., 2008; Schmid et al., 2014). Douglas-fir was introduced into Germany from North America more than 150 years ago and has become the most abundant non-native tree species cultivated in Central Europe (Schmid et al., 2014). To better understand the response of microorganisms in litter and soil to planting different tree species in monoculture and mixture, physiological (respiration based) and community approaches (phospholipid fatty acids analysis) were combined. We quantified microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass, as well as community structure and stress indicators of microorganisms (Anderson and Domsch, 2010). Physiological response variables and stress indicators were used as functional indicators of microbial communities. Generally, we assumed the structure of microbial communities to be linked to their functioning. Specifically, we hypothesized (1) coniferous trees to detrimentally affect microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass and stress indicators, with the effects being similar in Norway spruce and Douglas-fir forests, but alleviated in mixed forests with beech. Further, we hypothesized (2) effects of forest types on microbial community structure and functioning to be present at both nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites, but to be stronger at nutrient-poor sites. Since the litter layer is less buffered against environmental conditions than the organic and mineral soil, we also hypothesized that (3) the effects of forest type on the structure and functioning of microbial communities are more pronounced in litter than in soil.

2. Methods

2.1. Field sites

The study was conducted in 40 forest stands located in the south and north of Lower Saxony in Germany (eight sites x five forest types; Fig. S1). Eight sites were selected to cover a range of soil nutrients and water conditions based on prior knowledge of soil types and annual total rainfall. Four sites in the south stock on fertile soil and receive higher precipitation. Parental rock material is either loess influenced Triassic sandstone or Paleozoic shares of greywacke, sandstone, quartzite and phyllite, leading to soil types of partly podsolic Cambisol and Luvisol. Mean annual precipitation is 821 – 1029 mm (calculated from German weather service since 1981, Glatthorn 2017). The four northern sites are located on out-washed sand with the soil type of Podzol. The mean annual precipitation is 672 – 746 mm (Table S1). Each site (quintet) comprised three pure stands of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.; Be), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* [Mirbel] Franco.; Do), Norway spruce (*Picea abies* [L.] Karst.; Sp) and two conifer-beech mixtures (Douglas-fir/European beech and Norway spruce/European beech; Do/Be and Sp/Be, respectively). On average trees were more than 50 years old in 2017. Within quintets, the distance between plots ranged from 76 m to 4600

144 m, and the distance of quintets ranged from 5 to 190 km. Within each stand, plots of 2500 m^2 were
145 established, mostly in rectangular shape (50 x 50 m). Tree species in pure stands comprised more than 90%
146 of the total basal area, and that in mixed stands 33 – 53% for beech and 53 – 60% for conifers.

147 2.2. Soil sampling and properties

148 Samples were taken in the eight quintets between November 2017 and January 2018. Soil cores of 5 cm
149 diameters were taken by a metal cylinder, and were separated into litter, 0 – 5 and 5 – 10 cm soil depth. In
150 each plot, three cores spaced by 5 m were taken. Samples from the same depth were pooled, resulting in a
151 total of 120 samples (40 plots × 3 depths). The soil was sieved through 2 mm mesh, and the litter was
152 fragmented into pieces using scissors (approximately < 25 mm^2) (Maraun and Scheu, 1995). Roots and
153 stones were removed. Samples were frozen at -20°C and thawed at 4°C before the analyses. The pH (KCl) of
154 litter and soil was determined using a ratio of sample to solution of 1:10, 1:5 and 1:2.5 (g/v) for litter, 0 – 5
155 and 5 – 10 cm soil, respectively. Dried soil (70°C, 48 h) was grinded in a ball mill and then total C and N
156 concentrations were determined by an elemental analyzer (NA 1110, CE-instruments, Rodano, Milano, Italy).

157 2.3. Microbial basal respiration and biomass.

158 Microbial respiration was measured by O_2 consumption using an automated micro-respirometer. The system
159 absorbs CO_2 produced by microorganisms using KOH solution, and the O_2 consumption by microorganisms is
160 replaced through electrolytic release of O_2 from $CuSO_4$ solution (Scheu, 1992). Microbial basal respiration
161 was measured as mean consumption of O_2 during 10 – 23 h after attachment of the vessels to the
162 respirometer system (BR; µg O_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}). Microbial biomass was determined by substrate-induced respiration
163 after the addition of glucose to saturate microbial glycolytic enzymes based on the maximum initial
164 respiratory response 4 – 7 h after the addition of glucose (*MIRR*; µl O_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}) and converted to microbial
165 biomass (C_{mic}; µg C_{mic} g^{-1}) as 38 × *MIRR* (Anderson and Domsch, 1978; Beck et al., 1997). Fresh litter and soil
166 from 0 – 5 and 5 – 10 cm depth equivalent to approximately 0.3, 1 and 3.5 g dry mass was supplemented
167 with 80, 20 and 8 mg glucose solved in 400 µl H_2O, respectively. Microbial specific respiration was calculated
168 as the ratio between microbial basal respiration and microbial biomass (qO_2; µg O_2 $µg^{-1}$ C_{mic} h^{-1}).

169 2.4. Phospholipid fatty acid analysis

170 To quantify the composition of phospholipid-derived fatty acid (PLFA) composition, lipids from leaf litter and
171 soil were extracted using a modified Bligh and Dyer method (Frostegård et al., 1993b) as described in
172 Pollierer et al. (2015). Lipids were fractionated into glycolipids, phospholipids and neutral lipids by elution
173 through silica acid columns using chloroform, acetone and methanol, respectively (0.5 g silicic acid, 3 ml; HF
174 BOND ELUT-SI, Varian, Inc., Darmstadt, Germany). Phospholipids were subjected to mild alkaline
175 methanolysis, and fatty acid methyl esters (FAMEs) of phospholipids were identified by chromatographic

176 retention time compared to a general reference standard and a bacteria-derived standard (FAME
177 CRM47885, C11 to C24; BAME 47080-U, C11 to C20; Sigma-Aldrich, Darmstadt, Germany) using a GC-FID
178 Clarus 500 (PerkinElmer Corporation, Norwalk, USA) equipped with an Elite 5 column (30 m × 0.32 mm inner
179 diameter, film thickness 0.25 µm). The temperature program started with 60 °C (hold time 1 min) and
180 increased with 30 °C per min to 160 °C, and then by 3 °C per min to 280 °C. The injection temperature was
181 250 °C and helium was used as carrier gas. About 2 g of fresh litter and 4 g of fresh soil were used for the
182 extraction.

183 2.5. Stress indicators and fatty acid markers

184 The ratio of cyclopropyl PLFAs to their monoenoic precursors (cy/pre) and the ratio of saturated to
185 monounsaturated PLFAs (sat/mono) were used as indicators of physiological or nutritional stress ([(cy17:0 +
186 cy19:0)/(16:1ω7 + 18:1ω7)]; [(14:0 + 15:0 + 16:0 + 17:0 + 18:0)/(16:1ω7 + 17:1 + 18:1ω9 + 18:1ω7)];
187 respectively) (Moore-Kucera and Dick, 2008; Pollierer et al., 2015). The ratio of Gram-positive to Gram-
188 negative bacteria ($Gram^+$/ $Gram^-$) was used as indicator of carbon availability (Fanin et al., 2019). Linoleic
189 acid 18:2ω6,9 was used as fungal marker (Frostegård and Bååth, 1996). The saturated fatty acids i15:0,
190 a15:0, i16:0, i17:0 were used as markers for $Gram^+$ bacteria, and the fatty acids cy17:0, cy19:0, 16:1ω7 and
191 18:1ω7 were assigned as markers for $Gram^-$ bacteria (Frostegård and Bååth, 1996; Zelles, 1999; Mitchell et
192 al., 2010; Richter et al., 2018; Fanin et al., 2019). Bacterial biomass was represented by the sum of $Gram^+$
193 and $Gram^-$ bacteria. Total amount of PLFAs were summed up from all identified PLFAs (n = 40; nmol g^{-1} dry
194 weight) and was used to calculate PLFA proportions. All stress indicators and FA markers were analyzed from
195 proportions (mole percentage).

196 2.6. Statistical analyses

197 For univariate analysis, we first fitted linear mixed models (LMMs) to log-transformed response variables
198 and then applied planned contrasts to estimate the effect size of forest type and quintet group (Piovia-Scott
199 et al., 2019). All LMMs included Forest type (European beech, Douglas-fir, Douglas-fir/European beech,
200 Norway spruce, Norway spruce/European beech), Quintet group (nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites) and
201 Depth (litter, 0 – 5 and 5 – 10 cm) as fixed effects. Backwards model selection was applied to full models,
202 and minimal models included all main effects and the interaction of forest type and quintet group. The 40
203 forest plots were included as random effects to account for non-independence of samples of different depth
204 from the same plot by forcing values from the same plot to have the same intercept (Harrison et al., 2018).
205 In addition, the eight quintets were included as random effect depending on model selection. To meet the
206 assumption of homogeneity of variance, the mean - variance relationship was accounted for by a dispersion
207 parameter according for depth or forest type. All model selections followed the Akaike Information Criterion
208 (AIC) (Zuur et al., 2009).

209 Contrasts for the effect size of forest type were designed to compare coniferous and mixed forests to beech
210 forests. European beech, the climax tree species in lowland and lower montane regions of Central Europe,
211 was used as reference (Leuschner et al., 2017). Due to the property of log-transformed response variables,
212 the planned contrasts are analog to log response ratios (Piovia-Scott et al., 2019). Further, the log response
213 ratios were back transformed into response ratios and were used as effect size. Effect sizes of forest type
214 were estimated separately for nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. Additionally, we applied contrasts
215 between nutrient-poor vs. nutrient-rich sites in a similar way for the effect size of quintet group. Univariate
216 response variables included microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass, microbial specific respiration,
217 stress indicators and PLFA markers.

218 For multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), PLFAs first were arcsine root transformed and then
219 dimensions of fatty acids were reduced by principal component analysis (PCA). Separate MANOVAs for each
220 sample depth were calculated to inspect for effects of Forest type, Quintet group and their interactions. Soil
221 properties (pH, C/N ratio) were included as covariates in multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA)
222 (Langerhans et al., 2007). Significant principal components (PCs) were determined by broken stick criterion
223 (MacArthur, 1957). Only fatty acids ≥ 0.2% mean mole proportion were included in the analyses.

224 All analyses were done in R (version 3.6.2) with R studio interface (V.1.2.5033) (R Core Team, 2019; RStudio
225 Team, 2019). We used the "nlme" package to fit the linear mixed-effects models (Pinheiro et al., 2019), and
226 the "emmeans" package to conduct planned contrasts (Lenth, 2019). All mixed models met the assumptions
227 of normality of residuals and homogeneity of variance (Johnson and Omland, 2004). Raw data and codes will
228 be uploaded to *gfbio.org* as soon as the manuscript is accepted.

229 3. Results

230 3.1. Functional indicators of microorganisms

231 Forest type consistently affected microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass and stress indicators at
232 nutrient-poor but not at nutrient-rich sites (Forest type x Quintet group interactions; all $P < 0.083$; Table 1,
233 Figs 1 and 2), and this was generally true across the studied soil layers (Fig. S2). At nutrient-poor sites,
234 microbial basal respiration and microbial biomass was lower in coniferous and mixed forests than in the
235 beech forests. This was most pronounced in Douglas-fir where at nutrient-poor sites basal respiration and
236 microbial biomass were 65% and 59% lower compared to beech, respectively; similarly, basal respiration and
237 microbial biomass in the two conifer-beech mixtures were 46 – 56% lower than in pure beech. Microbial
238 basal respiration and microbial biomass in spruce forests were also lower than in beech forests, but the
239 difference was less pronounced (-33 to -36%; Fig. 1). In addition, in Douglas-fir forests at the nutrient-poor
240 sites the microbial specific respiration was 19% lower compared to beech.

In contrast to basal respiration and microbial biomass, at nutrient-poor sites stress indicators, the cy/pre ratio, the sat/mono ratio as well as the $Gram^+/Gram^-$ bacteria ratio, all were lower in beech forests than in the other forest types (Fig. 2). The difference in the cy/pre and sat/mono ratio was most pronounced in Douglas-fir (+87% and +74%) and less in spruce forests (+39% and +43%). Similar to spruce forest, the cy/pre and sat/mono ratio in conifer-beech mixtures was on average 37 – 46% higher than in beech forests. Effects of forest type on the $Gram^+/Gram^-$ bacteria ratio also was strongest in Douglas-fir forests (+46 %) and less pronounced in the other forest types (+21 – 29%). Stress indicators generally did not differ at nutrient-rich sites ($P > 0.31$; Fig. 2, Fig. S2, Table S2).

The response of microorganisms to changes in site conditions also varied between forest types. Differences between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites were most prominent in Douglas-fir forests and not significant in beech forests (Figs 3 and 4, Table S3). At nutrient-poor sites, microbial basal respiration in Douglas-fir forests was 57% lower and microbial biomass in Douglas-fir pure and mixed forests both were 47% lower compared to nutrient-rich sites. Similarly, but less strong, microbial biomass in spruce mixed forests was 36% lower at nutrient-poor sites than nutrient-rich sites. Conversely, in Douglas-fir forests the stress indicator cy/pre ratio at nutrient-poor sites exceeded that of nutrient-rich sites by 82% (Fig. 4, Table S3). Similarly, in Douglas-fir forests the sat/mono and $Gram^+/Gram^-$ bacteria ratio at nutrient-poor sites exceeded that at nutrient-rich sites by 38 – 40%. Further, in Douglas-fir mixed forests the $Gram^+/Gram^-$ bacteria ratio at nutrient-poor sites exceeded that at nutrient-poor sites by 34%.

3.2. Microbial community structure

As indicated by PLFA patterns, microbial community composition in beech forest differed from that in Norway spruce and Douglas-fir forests, with mixed forests being intermediate between the respective single species stands (Fig. 5). However, effects of forest type varied among soil layers and were most pronounced in litter and 0 – 5 cm soil, but only marginally significant in 5 – 10 cm soil (Table 2). Despite strong turnover between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites (Quintet group effects $p < 0.001$), beech maintained similar microbial community structure between nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites, and this was most pronounced in 0 – 5 cm soil depth (Forest type × Quintet group interaction; Table 2, Fig. 5).

A number of fatty acids contributed to the separation of microbial communities of the different forest types and quintet groups. Beech forests were characterized by unsaturated fatty acids at all soil depths, in particular by 16:1ω7, 18:1ω7, 18:1ω9 (Fig. 5). Norway spruce forests were associated with long-chain saturated fatty acids (22:0, 24:0), and Douglas-fir forests with bacterial marker fatty acids (2OH-14:0, cy17:0). There also were clear differences in fatty acid patterns between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites. Litter at nutrient-rich sites was associated with unsaturated fatty acids such as 18:1ω9 and the fungal marker 18:2ω6,9. By contrast, nutrient-poor sites had higher saturated and branched fatty acids, with many

of them being bacterial markers, such as 14:0 and cy17:0 and cy19:0. Whereas the litter layer at nutrient-rich sites was richer in fungi than at nutrient-poor sites, the opposite was true for the soil (Quintet group × Depth interaction; Table 1, Figs S3 and S4).

As indicated by PLFA markers, the relative abundance of fungi and bacteria generally did not differ among forest types, but consistently the relative abundance of fungi decreased, whereas the abundance of bacteria increased with soil depth (Table 1, Fig. S3). Further, the abundance of fungi in the soil of Douglas-fir forests was lower than in beech forests and the difference was more pronounced in 5 – 10 cm soil compared to other depths at nutrient-poor sites (Fig. S4).

The northern nutrient-poor sites also were more acidic and more limited by nitrogen as indicated by lower soil pH and higher C/N ratio, and the main effects of Quintet group and Forest type became non-significant when pH and C/N ratio were included as covariates in the multivariate analysis in soil (Table 2, Fig. 5). In addition, soil pH significantly explained the structure of microbial communities particularly in 0 – 5 cm depth (Table 2).

4. Discussion

Overall, the results only in part support our first and second hypotheses, because forest types only affected the functioning of microbial communities at nutrient-poor sites, but not at nutrient-rich sites. At nutrient-poor sites, microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass and stress indicators were all detrimentally affected in pure and mixed coniferous forests, and contrasting our first hypothesis the effects differed between Douglas-fir and Norway spruce, with the effects being particularly strong in Douglas-fir but less pronounced in those of Norway spruce and mixed stands. By contrast, the surprising similar basal respiration, microbial biomass and stress indicators at nutrient-rich sites partially contradict our second hypothesis, and suggest that, at favorable environmental conditions, soil microbial communities are rather irresponsive to changes in tree species. Notably, microbial biomass and microbial stress indicators in beech forests did not differ between nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites indicating that beech is able to maintain the functioning of soil microbial communities regardless of site conditions. Admixture of beech in mixed stands with Douglas-fir or Norway spruce both detrimentally affected microbial biomass and microbial stress indicators, suggesting that the admixture of conifers to beech stands need to be cautious for both of the conifers. However, compared to pure Douglas-fir forests, mixed Douglas-fir forests could compromise the detrimental effects of pure Douglas-fir forests. Exotic plants lack co-evolutionary history with native species and therefore, complementary effects between native and exotic plants may be stronger and more likely to occur than between native species (Kawaletz et al., 2013). This may also explain why alleviation of microbial stress in mixture with Douglas-fir than in those with Norway spruce.

306 The site- and tree species-specific responses of microorganisms are likely caused by varying supply of energy
307 in the different forest types at nutrient-poor sites. In fact, at nutrient-poor sites the higher $Gram^+/Gram^-$
308 bacteria ratio in coniferous and mixed forests suggests lower supply of labile carbon in those forest types
309 than in beech (Fanin et al., 2019). Labile carbon compounds have been suggested to favor $Gram^-$ bacteria,
310 whereas $Gram^+$ bacteria better cope with recalcitrant carbon resources (Gleixner, 2008; Fanin et al., 2019;
311 Kramer and Waller et al., 2020). Douglas-fir forests were particularly limited of labile carbon as supported by
312 its lower microbial specific respiration, which is largely due to its lower microbial basal respiration compared
313 to beech stands (Anderson and Domsch, 2010). Limited supply of labile of carbon has also been suggested to
314 favor oligotrophic microbial communities characterized by low respiration rates and biomass (Potthast et al.,
315 2010; Fanin et al., 2019). This is consistent with our findings of high carbon limitation as well as low basal
316 respiration and microbial biomass in single and mixed coniferous forests at nutrient-poor sites. Moreover, at
317 nutrient-poor sites the ratios of cy/pre and sat/mono were higher in pure species coniferous as well as
318 mixed forests than in beech, also indicating increased nutrient (and/or water) stress in the former (Moore-
319 Kucera and Dick, 2008; Pollierer et al., 2015). The fatty acids 16:1ω7 and 18:1ω7, part of $Gram^-$ bacteria
320 marker, are precursors of cyclopropyl fatty acids and as monounsaturated fatty acids, and they form part of
321 the nominator of the calculated stress indicators. The more pronounced stress response of microorganism in
322 coniferous and mixed forests at nutrient-poor sites was largely caused by their lower concentration of these
323 two ω7 fatty acids. Indeed, it has been suggested that under stress conditions $Gram^-$ bacteria change the
324 composition of their cell membranes from 16:1ω7 and 18:1ω7 to cyclopropane fatty acids associated with
325 slower growth rates (Guckert et al., 1986; Kieft et al., 1994; Lundquist et al., 1999). The similarity of
326 microbial indicators in beech forests at nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites indicates that, compared to
327 coniferous stands, beech maintained microbial community functioning and avoided stress conditions of
328 microorganisms by providing more labile carbon resources at nutrient-poor conditions, presumably by
329 releasing high amounts of root-derived resources.

330 The conclusion that beech is able to alleviate microbial stress via maintaining or even increasing the release
331 of root-derived resources at nutrient-poor sites is supported by the following findings. First, current studies
332 at our study sites showed that at nutrient-poor sites biomass of fine roots is higher in beech forests than in
333 pure and mixed coniferous forests while at nutrient-rich sites their biomass being similar (diameter < 2 mm;
334 pers. comm. A. Lwila). Generally, it is well established that plants allocate more resources into roots if the
335 availability of soil nutrients is declining and this is associated with increased root exudations (Eisenhauer et
336 al., 2017; Laliberté et al., 2017). Recently, this also was confirmed for beech forests where increased root
337 exudation at more acidic and nitrogen deficient stands (Meier et al., 2020). These findings support our
338 conclusion that beech indeed maintained or even increased its root exudates at nutrient-poor sites of our
339 study which in fact were characterized by more acidic conditions and higher C/N ratio in soil, and this

alleviated microbial resource deficiency and stress. Second, trenching and girdling experiments confirmed that reducing or omitting the flux of root-derived resources into the soil strongly reduces fungal and bacterial biomass, demonstrating the importance of root-derived resources for maintaining soil microbial biomass (Högberg et al., 2007; Kaiser et al., 2010; Bluhm et al., 2019). Notably, we sampled litter and soil during autumn / winter after beech had shed its leaves. Nevertheless, the evidence provided above suggests that the impact of roots on microorganisms still was strong indicating that not only recent photosynthates but also stored carbohydrates contribute to providing root-derived resources to soil microorganisms (Druebert et al., 2009). Further, these findings suggest that beech has the potential to facilitate soil microorganisms at environmental stress conditions by maintaining or even increasing its root exudates contrasting both of the studied conifer species. This ability presumably contributed to the mitigation of the detrimental effects of Douglas-fir on microorganisms at nutrient-poor / acidic sites in mixed forests. More broadly, it may even explain the observed overyielding in mixed stands of beech and conifers at nutrient-poor sites, highlighting the potential role of microorganisms in the facilitation of plants under environment stress conditions (Toïgo et al., 2015; Ammer, 2019; David et al., 2020).

Contrary to our third hypothesis, the effect of forest type was not stronger in litter than in soil. At nutrient-poor sites, forest type affected microbial basal respiration, microbial biomass and microbial stress in both litter and soil, with the strength of effects generally being similar across layer. This supports our conclusion that the effect of forest type was not mainly due to differences in litter quantity and quality, but in particular to differences in root-derived resources. This contrasts earlier suggestions that microorganisms in litter are more sensitive to changes in environmental conditions than those in soil because litter is less buffered against environmental harshness (Pollierer et al., 2015). Supporting our conclusion that microorganisms in soil sensitively respond to environmental changes, microbial stress indicators generally increased while microbial biomass generally decreased with soil depth. This sensitivity presumably is related to the fact that carbon availability generally decreases with soil depth resulting in stronger resource limitation (Fierer et al., 2003).

We assumed that the functioning of microorganisms ultimately relies on its microbial community structure, and this is supported by the consistent turnover in microbial community composition as well as the change in microbial functions between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites. Further, in contrast to coniferous and mixed forests, microbial community structure and functional indices in beech forests differed little between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites, suggesting that among the tree species studied only beech is better able to maintain and stabilize microbial community structure and functioning in litter and soil irrespective of site conditions. Notably, differences in microbial community structure between forest types at nutrient-rich sites tended to be small in 5 – 10 cm soil depth, further suggesting that the influence of tree species fades

deeper in soil. By contrast, at nutrient-poor sites, differences in microbial community structure between forest types were relatively large in soil, again supporting our conclusion that at nutrient-poor sites effects of tree species on microorganisms in soil are predominantly due to differences in root-derived resources. Interestingly, the differences in microbial community structure between beech and coniferous forests in 5 – 10 cm soil depth at nutrient-poor sites were most pronounced in Douglas-fir and carbon limitation also was most prominent in 5 – 10 cm soil of Douglas-fir forests as indicated by a lower microbial specific respiration. This implies that among the tree species studied Douglas-fir provides the lowest amount of root-derived resources to soil microorganisms at nutrient-poor sites resulting in pronounced resource shortage and marked changes in microbial community composition. Such changes in microbial community structure may significantly impact the functioning of soil microbial communities as the availability of carbon resources and carbon limitation affect the vertical distribution of saprotrophic fungi and decomposition processes, e.g. by shifting the competition between saprotrophic and mycorrhizal fungi (Gadgil and Gadgil, 1971; Lindahl et al., 2007).

The relative abundance of fungi and bacteria differed between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites, but less among forest types. As indicated by the fungal marker FA 18:2ω6,9, nutrient-poor sites had higher relative abundance of fungal than nutrient-rich sites in spruce and beech forests, supporting earlier suggestions that the fungal energy channel dominates in low fertile systems (Wardle et al., 2004). However, in contrast to beech and spruce, the relative abundance of fungi in pure and mixed forests of Douglas-fir was not higher at nutrient-poor sites than that at nutrient-rich sites. Further, at nutrient-poor sites the abundance of fungi was lower in Douglas-fir than in beech forests and this was most pronounced in 5 – 10 cm depth. Potentially, the lower abundance of fungi in soil of Douglas-fir forests is due to a mismatch between local and home (native range of Douglas-fir) fungal communities (Schmid et al., 2014). In fact, in soil of introduced plant species only a subset of fungal species present in their native range has been recorded in soil of sites where they had been introduced (Schmid et al., 2014). Future studies need to examine in more detail the taxonomic composition of microbial communities in different forest types, including introduced and native tree species such as Douglas-fir and beech in particular at nutrient-poor sites deeper in soil.

In addition to quality and quantity of root-derived resources, tree species may affect microbial community structure in soil by modifying chemical properties. In our study, soil properties, especially pH, well explained changes in the community structure of microorganisms in soil. This finding is consistent with results of continental scale studies as well as local liming experiments suggesting that soil pH is among the most prominent driver of microbial community composition (Frostegård et al., 1993a; Fierer and Jackson, 2006). Further, soil pH generally correlates negatively with soil nutrient availability, supporting the importance of nutrients in the mediation of microbial responses (Meier et al., 2020). However, factors other than soil pH

and soil nutrient status may have contributed to the observed differences between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites. In fact, nutrient-poor sites also were characterized by lower precipitation and this is reflected by higher $\delta^{13}C$ values of litter at nutrient-poor compared to nutrient-rich sites (Peuke et al., 2006), potentially resulted from higher water stress at nutrient-poor compared to nutrient-rich sites (J. Lu unpubl. data). Presumably, in addition to pH, both nutrients and water stress contributed to the observed differences in microbial community composition and functioning between nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. This is supported by the fact that soil water conditions are intricately linked to soil nutrient dynamics and the uptake of nutrients by plants (de Vries et al., 2019). Future studies need to disentangle the relative importance of water deficiency, nutrient availability and soil pH as driving factors of the interrelationship between tree species and soil microbial community composition and functioning. Focusing on nutrient-poor / low pH stands is most promising for resolving these interrelationships.

5. Conclusion

The present study documented that effects of forest type on soil microbial communities vary among tree species and mixed stands, but this strongly depends on the nutrient status of the sites. Notably, variations between sites were least pronounced in native beech and most pronounced in introduced Douglas-fir. Compared to beech, Douglas-fir strongly impacted microbial community structure and functioning at nutrient-poor sites. Therefore, in the long-term planting non-native tree species such as Douglas-fir may compromise ecosystem functioning at nutrient-poor sites, and this needs to be studied in more detail as it may not only question the establishment of pure Douglas-fir forests, but also the enrichment of beech forests by Douglas-fir at nutrient-poor sites. However, as planting Douglas-fir in single species and mixed stands with beech hardly impacted the structure and functioning of soil microbial communities at nutrient-rich sites, planting Douglas-fir may provide an alternative option to Norway spruce at least at nutrient-rich sites. Such options are urgently needed since Norway spruce forests are increasingly threatened due to global climate change and associated outbreaks of bark beetles especially in lowland regions of Europe. Further, more information is needed for gaining a holistic understanding on the consequences of planting single species or mixed stands of Douglas-fir on ecosystem properties and processes, such as below- and aboveground biodiversity of other taxa, and the decomposition of litter. Future studies need to focus on potential facilitation or inhibition of planting mixed forests of beech and Douglas-fir on soil microorganisms and timber yield in particular at nutrient-poor sites. Overall, our findings highlight that tree species differently shape the structure and functioning of soil microbial communities with their effects vary strongly with soil conditions.

Acknowledgements

We thank C. Bluhm, T. Volovei, G. Humpert, S. Zhou for assistance, and C. Ammer, H. Riebl, A. Polle, J. Glatthorn, X. Lu, Z. Li, N. Lamersdorf, T.-W. Chen, S. Bluhm, G. Schulz, M. Maraun, T. Kneib, A. Lwila, K. Schumann, I. Bebre, A. Rivera and other RTG members for helpful discussions. The study formed part of the Research Training Group 2300: "Enrichment of European beech forests with conifers: impacts of functional traits on ecosystem functioning" (GRK 2300). Financial support by the German Research Foundation is gratefully acknowledged (DFG: 316045089).

References

Ammer, C., 2019. Diversity and forest productivity in a changing climate. New Phytologist 221, 50–66. doi:10.1111/nph.15263

Ammer, C., Fichtner, A., Fischer, A., Gossner, M.M., Meyer, P., Seidl, R., Thomas, F.M., Annighöfer, P., Kreyling, J., Ohse, B., Berger, U., Feldmann, E., Häberle, K.H., Heer, K., Heinrichs, S., Huth, F., Krämer-Klement, K., Mölder, A., Müller, J., Mund, M., Opgenoorth, L., Schall, P., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Seidel, D., Vogt, J., Wagner, S., 2018. Key ecological research questions for Central European forests. Basic and Applied Ecology 32, 3–25. doi:10.1016/j.baae.2018.07.006

Anderson, J.P.E., Domsch, K.H., 1978. A physiological method for the quantitative measurement of microbial biomass in soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 10, 215–221. doi:10.1016/0038-0717(78)90099-8

Anderson, T.H., Domsch, K.H., 2010. Soil microbial biomass: The eco-physiological approach. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 42, 2039–2043. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2010.06.026

Augusto, L., De Schrijver, A., Vesterdal, L., Smolander, A., Prescott, C., Ranger, J., 2015. Influences of evergreen gymnosperm and deciduous angiosperm tree species on the functioning of temperate and boreal forests. Biological Reviews 90, 444–466. doi:10.1111/brv.12119

Averill, C., Turner, B.L., Finzi, A.C., 2014. Mycorrhiza-mediated competition between plants and decomposers drives soil carbon storage. Nature 505, 543–545. doi:10.1038/nature12901

Balvanera, P., Pfisterer, A.B., Buchmann, N., He, J.S., Nakashizuka, T., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B., 2006. Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning and services. Ecology Letters 9, 1146–1156. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00963.x

Bardgett, R.D., van der Putten, W.H., 2014. Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. Nature 515, 505–511. doi:10.1038/nature13855

Bauhus, J., van der Meer, P.J., Kanninen, M., 2010. Plantation forests: global perspectives, in: Ecosystem Goods and Services from Plantation Forests. Earthscan, pp. 1–16. doi:10.4324/9781849776417

Beck, T., Joergensen, R.G., Kandeler, E., Makeschin, F., Nuss, E., Oberholzer, H.R., Scheu, S., 1997. An inter-laboratory comparison of ten different ways of measuring soil microbial biomass C. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 29, 1023–1032. doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(97)00030-8

Biedermann, P.H.W., Müller, J., Grégoire, J.C., Gruppe, A., Hagge, J., Hammerbacher, A., Hofstetter, R.W., Kandasamy, D., Kolarik, M., Kostovcik, M., Krokene, P., Sallé, A., Six, D.L., Turrini, T., Vanderpool, D., Wingfield, M.J., Bässler, C., 2019. Bark beetle population dynamics in the Anthropocene: Challenges and solutions. Trends in Ecology and Evolution. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2019.06.002

Bluhm, S.L., Eitzinger, B., Ferlian, O., Bluhm, C., Schröter, K., Pena, R., Maraun, M., Scheu, S., 2019. Deprivation of root-derived resources affects microbial biomass but not community structure in litter and soil. PLoS ONE 14, e0214233. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0214233

Brandl, S., Paul, C., Knoke, T., Falk, W., 2020. The influence of climate and management on survival probability for Germany's most important tree species. Forest Ecology and Management 458, 117652. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2019.117652

Callaway, R.M., Pennings, S.C., Richards, C.L., 2003. Phenotypic plasticity and interactions among plants. Ecology 84, 1115–1128. doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2003)084[1115:PPAIAP]2.0.CO;2

Cardinale, B.J., Wright, J.P., Cadotte, M.W., Carroll, I.T., Hector, A., Srivastava, D.S., Loreau, M., Weis, J.J., 2007. Impacts of plant diversity on biomass production increase through time because of species complementarity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 104, 18123–18128. doi:10.1073/pnas.0709069104

Chen, L., Xiang, W., Wu, H., Ouyang, S., Zhou, B., Zeng, Y., Chen, Y., Kuzyakov, Y., 2019. Tree species identity surpasses richness in affecting soil microbial richness and community composition in subtropical forests. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 130, 113–121. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.12.008

Chen, X., Chen, H.Y.H., Chen, C., Peng, S., 2019. Water availability regulates negative effects of species mixture on soil microbial biomass in boreal forests. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 139, 107634. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107634

Clemmensen, K.E., Bahr, A., Ovaskainen, O., Dahlberg, A., Ekblad, A., Wallander, H., Stenlid, J., Finlay, R.D., Wardle, D.A., Lindahl, B.D., 2013. Roots and associated fungi drive long-term carbon sequestration in boreal forest. Science 340, 1615–1618. doi:10.1126/science.1231923

David, A.S., Thapa-Magar, K.B., Menges, E.S., Searcy, C.A., Afkhami, M.E., 2020. Do plant–microbe interactions support the Stress Gradient Hypothesis? Ecology 00, e03081. doi:10.1002/ecy.3081

Dawud, S.M., Raulund-Rasmussen, K., Domisch, T., Finér, L., Jaroszewicz, B., Vesterdal, L., 2016. Is tree species diversity or species identity the more important driver of soil carbon stocks, C/N ratio, and pH? Ecosystems 19, 645–660. doi:10.1007/s10021-016-9958-1

de Vries, F.T., Williams, A., Stringer, F., Willcocks, R., McEwing, R., Langridge, H., Straathof, A.L., 2019. Changes in root-exudate-induced respiration reveal a novel mechanism through which drought affects ecosystem carbon cycling. New Phytologist 224, 132–145. doi:10.1111/nph.16001

Defossez, E., Courbaud, B., Marcais, B., Thuiller, W., Granda, E., Kunstler, G., 2011. Do interactions between plant and soil biota change with elevation? A study on *Fagus sylvatica*. Biology Letters 7, 699–701. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0236

Druebert, C., Lang, C., Valtanen, K., Polle, A., 2009. Beech carbon productivity as driver of ectomycorrhizal abundance and diversity. Plant, Cell and Environment 32, 992–1003. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.01983.x

Eisenhauer, N., Lanoue, A., Strecker, T., Scheu, S., Steinauer, K., Thakur, M.P., Mommer, L., 2017. Root biomass and exudates link plant diversity with soil bacterial and fungal biomass. Scientific Reports 7. doi:10.1038/srep44641

Ekblad, A., Nordgren, A., 2002. Is growth of soil microorganisms in boreal forests limited by carbon or nitrogen availability? Plant and Soil 242, 115–122. doi:10.1023/A:1019698108838

Emmett Duffy, J., Godwin, C.M., Cardinale, B.J., 2017. Biodiversity effects in the wild are common and as

strong as key drivers of productivity. Nature 549, 261–264. doi:10.1038/nature23886

Fanin, N., Kardol, P., Farrell, M., Nilsson, M.C., Gundale, M.J., Wardle, D.A., 2019. The ratio of Gram-positive to Gram-negative bacterial PLFA markers as an indicator of carbon availability in organic soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 128, 111–114. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.10.010

Fierer, N., Jackson, R.B., 2006. The diversity and biogeography of soil bacterial communities. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 103, 626–631. doi:10.1073/pnas.0507535103

Fierer, N., Schimel, J.P., Holden, P.A., 2003. Variations in microbial community composition through two soil depth profiles. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 35, 167–176. doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(02)00251-1

Frostegård, A., Bååth, E., 1996. The use of phospholipid fatty acid analysis to estimate bacterial and fungal biomass in soil. Biology and Fertility of Soils 22, 59–65. doi:10.1007/s003740050076

Frostegård, Å., Bååth, E., Tunlio, A., 1993a. Shifts in the structure of soil microbial communities in limed forests as revealed by phospholipid fatty acid analysis. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 25, 723–730. doi:10.1016/0038-0717(93)90113-P

Frostegård, Å., Tunlid, A., Baath, E., 1993b. Phospholipid fatty acid composition, biomass, and activity of microbial communities from two soil types experimentally exposed to different heavy metals. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 59, 3605–3617. doi:10.1128/aem.59.11.3605-3617.1993

Fujii, S., Berg, M.P., Cornelissen, J.H.C., 2020. Living Litter: Dynamic Trait Spectra Predict Fauna Composition. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 00. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2020.05.007

Gadgil, R.L., Gadgil, P.D., 1971. Mycorrhiza and litter decomposition. Nature 233, 133. doi:10.1038/233133a0

Glatthorn, J., 2017: plot_general. v1.10.8. RTG 2300-Information System. Dataset. https://www.134.76.21.10/Data/ShowData.aspx?DatasetId=12540

Graham, E.B., Knelman, J.E., Schindlbacher, A., Siciliano, S., Breulmann, M., Yannarell, A., Beman, J.M., Abell, G., Philippot, L., Prosser, J., Foulquier, A., Yuste, J.C., Glanville, H.C., Jones, D.L., Angel, R., Salminen, J., Newton, R.J., Bürgmann, H., Ingram, L.J., Hamer, U., Siljanen, H.M.P., Peltoniemi, K., Potthast, K., Bañeras, L., Hartmann, M., Banerjee, S., Yu, R.Q., Nogaro, G., Richter, A., Koranda, M., Castle, S.C., Goberna, M., Song, B., Chatterjee, A., Nunes, O.C., Lopes, A.R., Cao, Y., Kaisermann, A., Hallin, S., Strickland, M.S., Garcia-Pausas, J., Barba, J., Kang, H., Isobe, K., Papaspyrou, S., Pastorelli, R., Lagomarsino, A., Lindström, E.S., Basiliko, N., Nemergut, D.R., 2016. Microbes as engines of ecosystem function: When does community structure enhance predictions of ecosystem processes? Frontiers in Microbiology 7, 214. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.00214

Guckert, J.B., Hood, M.A., White, D.C., 1986. Phospholipid ester-linked fatty acid profile changes during nutrient deprivation of Vibrio cholerae: Increases in the trans/cis ratio and proportions of cyclopropyl fatty acids. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 52, 794–801. doi:10.1128/aem.52.4.794-801.1986

Harpole, W.S., Sullivan, L.L., Lind, E.M., Firn, J., Adler, P.B., Borer, E.T., Chase, J., Fay, P.A., Hautier, Y., Hillebrand, H., MacDougall, A.S., Seabloom, E.W., Williams, R., Bakker, J.D., Cadotte, M.W., Chaneton, E.J., Chu, C., Cleland, E.E., D'Antonio, C., Davies, K.F., Gruner, D.S., Hagenah, N., Kirkman, K., Knops, J.M.H., La Pierre, K.J., McCulley, R.L., Moore, J.L., Morgan, J.W., Prober, S.M., Risch, A.C., Schuetz, M., Stevens, C.J., Wragg, P.D., 2016. Addition of multiple limiting resources reduces grassland diversity. Nature 537, 93–96. doi:10.1038/nature19324

Harrison, X.A., Donaldson, L., Correa-Cano, M.E., Evans, J., Fisher, D.N., Goodwin, C.E.D., Robinson, B.S., Hodgson, D.J., Inger, R., 2018. A brief introduction to mixed effects modelling and multi-model

inference in ecology. PeerJ 2018, 1–32. doi:10.7717/peerj.4794

Hättenschwiler, S., Tiunov, A. V., Scheu, S., 2005. Biodiversity and litter decomposition in terrestrial ecosystems. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 36, 191–218. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.112904.151932

Högberg, M.N., Högberg, P., Myrold, D.D., 2007. Is microbial community composition in boreal forest soils determined by pH, C-to-N ratio, the trees, or all three? Oecologia 150, 590–601. doi:10.1007/s00442-006-0562-5

Högberg, P., Read, D.J., 2006. Towards a more plant physiological perspective on soil ecology. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 21, 548–554. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2006.06.004

Hu, J., Angeli, S., Schuetz, S., Luo, Y., Hajek, A.E., 2009. Ecology and management of exotic and endemic Asian longhorned beetle Anoplophora glabripennis. Agricultural and Forest Entomology 11, 359–375. doi:10.1111/j.1461-9563.2009.00443.x

Johnson, J.B., Omland, K.S., 2004. Model selection in ecology and evolution. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 19, 101–108. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2003.10.013

Jones, G.L., Scullion, J., Allison, G., Stott, H., Johnson, D., Owen, R., Williams, G., Gwynn-Jones, D., 2019. Reduced soil respiration beneath invasive Rhododendron ponticum persists after cutting and is related to substrate quality rather than microbial community. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 138. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107577

Kaiser, C., Koranda, M., Kitzler, B., Fuchslueger, L., Schnecker, J., Schweiger, P., Rasche, F., Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., Sessitsch, A., Richter, A., 2010. Belowground carbon allocation by trees drives seasonal patterns of extracellular enzyme activities by altering microbial community composition in a beech forest soil. New Phytologist 187, 843–858. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03321.x

Kawaletz, H., Mölder, I., Zerbe, S., Annighöfer, P., Terwei, A., Ammer, C., 2013. Exotic tree seedlings are much more competitive than natives but show underyielding when growing together. Journal of Plant Ecology 6, 305–315. doi:10.1093/jpe/rts044

Kieft, T.L., Ringelberg, D.B., White, D.C., 1994. Changes in ester-linked phospholipid fatty acid profiles of subsurface bacteria during starvation and desiccation in a porous medium. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 60, 3292–3299. doi:10.1128/aem.60.9.3292-3299.1994

Knoke, T., Ammer, C., Stimm, B., Mosandl, R., 2008. Admixing broadleaved to coniferous tree species: A review on yield, ecological stability and economics. European Journal of Forest Research 127, 89–101. doi:10.1007/s10342-007-0186-2

Kramer, C., Gleixner, G., 2008. Soil organic matter in soil depth profiles: Distinct carbon preferences of microbial groups during carbon transformation. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 40, 425–433. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2007.09.016

Laliberté, E., Kardol, P., Didham, R.K., Teste, F.P., Turner, B.L., Wardle, D.A., 2017. Soil fertility shapes belowground food webs across a regional climate gradient. Ecology Letters. doi:10.1111/ele.12823

Langerhans, R.B., Gifford, M.E., Joseph, E.O., 2007. Ecological speciation in Gambusia fishes. Evolution 61, 2056–2074. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00171.x

Lenth, R., 2019. emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.4.4. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans

Leuschner, C., Ellenberg, H., Leuschner, C., Ellenberg, H., 2017. Beech and mixed beech forests, in: Ecology of Central European Forests. Springer International Publishing, pp. 351–441. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-43042-3_5

Lindahl, B.D., Ihrmark, K., Boberg, J., Trumbore, S.E., Högberg, P., Stenlid, J., Finlay, R.D., 2007. Spatial separation of litter decomposition and mycorrhizal nitrogen uptake in a boreal forest. New Phytologist 173, 611–620. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2006.01936.x

Lundquist, E.J., Scow, K.M., Jackson, L.E., Uesugi, S.L., Johnson, C.R., 1999. Rapid response of soil microbial communities from conventional, low input, and organic farming systems to a wet/dry cycle. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 31, 1661–1675. doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00080-2

Ma, Z., Chen, H.Y.H., 2016. Effects of species diversity on fine root productivity in diverse ecosystems: a global meta-analysis. Global Ecology and Biogeography 25, 1387–1396. doi:10.1111/geb.12488

MacArthur, R.H., 1957. On the relative abundance of bird species. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 43, 293–295. doi:10.1073/pnas.43.3.293

Maraun, M., Scheu, S., 1995. Influence of beech litter fragmentation and glucose concentration on the microbial biomass in three different litter layers of a beechwood. Biology and Fertility of Soils 19, 155–158. doi:10.1007/BF00336152

Meier, I.C., Tückmantel, T., Heitkötter, J., Müller, K., Preusser, S., Wrobel, T.J., Kandeler, E., Marschner, B., Leuschner, C., 2020. Root exudation of mature beech forests across a nutrient availability gradient: the role of root morphology and fungal activity. New Phytologist 226, 583–594. doi:10.1111/nph.16389

Mitchell, R.J., Campbell, C.D., Chapman, S.J., Cameron, C.M., 2010. The ecological engineering impact of a single tree species on the soil microbial community. Journal of Ecology 98, 50–61. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01601.x

Moore-Kucera, J., Dick, R.P., 2008. PLFA profiling of microbial community structure and seasonal shifts in soils of a Douglas-fir chronosequence. Microbial Ecology 55, 500–511. doi:10.1007/s00248-007-9295-1

Nacke, H., Goldmann, K., Schöning, I., Pfeiffer, B., Kaiser, K., Villamizar, G.A.C., Schrumpf, M., Buscot, F., Daniel, R., Wubet, T., 2016. Fine spatial scale variation of soil microbial communities under European beech and Norway spruce. Frontiers in Microbiology 7. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.02067

Peuke, A.D., Gessler, A., Rennenberg, H., 2006. The effect of drought on C and N stable isotopes in different fractions of leaves, stems and roots of sensitive and tolerant beech ecotypes. Plant, Cell and Environment 29, 823–835. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2005.01452.x

Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., R Core Team, 2019. nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 3.1-142. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme

Piovia-Scott, J., Yang, L.H., Wright, A.N., Spiller, D.A., Schoener, T.W., 2019. Pulsed seaweed subsidies drive sequential shifts in the effects of lizard predators on island food webs. Ecology Letters 22, 1850–1859. doi:10.1111/ele.13377

Pollierer, M.M., Ferlian, O., Scheu, S., 2015. Temporal dynamics and variation with forest type of phospholipid fatty acids in litter and soil of temperate forests across regions. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 91, 248–257. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.08.035

Potthast, K., Hamer, U., Makeschin, F., 2010. Impact of litter quality on mineralization processes in managed and abandoned pasture soils in Southern Ecuador. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 42, 56–64. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.09.025

Pretzsch, H., Knoke, T., Paul, C., Bauhus, J., Forrester, D.I., 2017. Perspectives for future research on mixed-species systems, in: Mixed-Species Forests: Ecology and Management. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 579–606. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-54553-9_12

R Core Team, 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Fundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/.

Ratcliffe, S., Wirth, C., Jucker, T., van der Plas, F., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Verheyen, K., Allan, E., Benavides, R., Bruelheide, H., Ohse, B., Paquette, A., Ampoorter, E., Bastias, C.C., Bauhus, J., Bonal, D., Bouriaud, O., Bussotti, F., Carnol, M., Castagneyrol, B., Chećko, E., Dawud, S.M., Wandeler, H. De, Domisch, T., Finér, L., Fischer, M., Fotelli, M., Gessler, A., Granier, A., Grossiord, C., Guyot, V., Haase, J., Hättenschwiler, S., Jactel, H., Jaroszewicz, B., Joly, F.X., Kambach, S., Kolb, S., Koricheva, J., Liebersgesell, M., Milligan, H., Müller, S., Muys, B., Nguyen, D., Nock, C., Pollastrini, M., Purschke, O., Radoglou, K., Raulund-Rasmussen, K., Roger, F., Ruiz-Benito, P., Seidl, R., Selvi, F., Seiferling, I., Stenlid, J., Valladares, F., Vesterdal, L., Baeten, L., 2017. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning relations in European forests depend on environmental context. Ecology Letters. doi:10.1111/ele.12849

Richter, A., Schöning, I., Kahl, T., Bauhus, J., Ruess, L., 2018. Regional environmental conditions shape microbial community structure stronger than local forest management intensity. Forest Ecology and Management 409, 250–259. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2017.11.027

RStudio Team, 2019. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Rstudio, Inc., Boston, MA. https://www.rstudio.com/.

Scheibe, A., Steffens, C., Seven, J., Jacob, A., Hertel, D., Leuschner, C., Gleixner, G., 2015. Effects of tree identity dominate over tree diversity on the soil microbial community structure. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 81, 219–227. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.11.020

Scheu, S., 1992. Automated measurement of the respiratory response of soil microcompartments: Active microbial biomass in earthworm faeces. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 24, 1113–1118. doi:10.1016/0038-0717(92)90061-2

Scheu, S., Albers, D., Alphei, J., Buryn, R., Klages, U., Migge, S., Platner, C., Salamon, J.-A., 2003. The soil fauna community in pure and mixed stands of beech and spruce of different age: trophic structure and structuring forces. Oikos 101, 225–238. doi:DOI 10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.12131.x

Schmid, M., Pautasso, M., Holdenrieder, O., 2014. Ecological consequences of Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii) cultivation in Europe. European Journal of Forest Research 133, 13–29. doi:10.1007/s10342-013-0745-7

Schmidt, M.W.I., Torn, M.S., Abiven, S., Dittmar, T., Guggenberger, G., Janssens, I.A., Kleber, M., Kögel-Knabner, I., Lehmann, J., Manning, D.A.C., Nannipieri, P., Rasse, D.P., Weiner, S., Trumbore, S.E., 2011. Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property. Nature. doi:10.1038/nature10386

Toïgo, M., Vallet, P., Perot, T., Bontemps, J.D., Piedallu, C., Courbaud, B., 2015. Overyielding in mixed forests decreases with site productivity. Journal of Ecology 103, 502–512. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12353

van der Heijden, M.G.A., Bardgett, R.D., Van Straalen, N.M., 2008. The unseen majority: Soil microbes as drivers of plant diversity and productivity in terrestrial ecosystems. Ecology Letters 11, 296–310. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01139.x

Waller, L.P., Allen, W.J., Barratt, B.I.P., Condron, L.M., França, F.M., Hunt, J.E., Koele, N., Orwin, K.H., Steel, G.S., Tylianakis, J.M., Wakelin, S.A., Dickie, I.A., 2020. Biotic interactions drive ecosystem responses to exotic plant invaders. Science 368, 967–972. doi:10.1126/science.aba2225

Wang, H., Liu, S.-R., Wang, J.-X., Shi, Z.-M., Xu, J., Hong, P.-Z., Ming, A.-G., Yu, H.-L., Chen, L., Lu, L.-H., Cai, D.-X., 2016. Differential effects of conifer and broadleaf litter inputs on soil organic carbon chemical composition through altered soil microbial community composition. Scientific Reports 6, 1–9. doi:10.1038/srep27097

Wardle, D.A., Bardgett, R.D., Klironomos, J.N., Setälä, H., Van Der Putten, W.H., Wall, D.H., 2004. Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota. Science. doi:10.1126/science.1094875

Yan, B., Ji, Z., Fan, B., Wang, X., He, G., Shi, L., Liu, G., 2016. Plants adapted to nutrient limitation allocate less biomass into stems in an arid-hot grassland. New Phytologist 211, 1232–1240. doi:10.1111/nph.13970

Zelles, L., 1999. Fatty acid patterns of phospholipids and lipopolysaccharides in the characterisation of microbial communities in soil: A review. Biology and Fertility of Soils 29, 111–129. doi:10.1007/s003740050533

Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., Smith, G.M., 2009. Dealing with Heterogeneity, in: Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R. Springer Science & Business Media, pp. 71–100. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6_4

Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Effects of conifers and conifer-beech mixtures (Douglas-fir [Do], Douglas-fir with beech [Do/Be], Norway spruce [Sp] and Norway spruce with beech [Sp/Be]) on microbial basal respiration (µg O_2 g^{-1} C h^{-1}), microbial biomass (µg C_{mic} g^{-1} C) and microbial specific respiration (µg O_2 µg^{-1} C_{mic} h^{-1}) at nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. Effect sizes are given as back transformed log response ratios compared to beech forests [ln (value in coniferous or mixed forest types / values in beech)]. Effect sizes were averaged across three depths (litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil). Values smaller than 1 indicate higher values in beech. Asterisks indicate significant effects ($p < 0.05$). Bars represent 95% confidence intervals (n=12).

Figure 2. Effects of conifers and conifer-beech mixtures (Douglas-fir [Do], Douglas-fir with beech [Do/Be], Norway spruce [Sp] and Norway spruce with beech [Sp/Be]) on stress indicators: ratio of cyclopropyl PLFAs to its monoenoic precursors, ratio of saturated to monounsaturated PLFAs, and ratio of Gram positive to Gram negative bacteria (cy/pre, sat/mono and Gram+/Gram-, respectively) at nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. Effect sizes are given as back transformed log response ratios compared to beech forests [ln (value in coniferous or mixed forest types / values in beech)]. Effect sizes were averaged across three depths (litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil). Values larger than 1 indicate lower values in beech. Asterisks indicate significant effects ($p < 0.05$). Bars represent 95% confidence intervals (n=12).

Figure 3. Changes in microbial basal respiration (µg O_2 g^{-1} C h^{-1}), microbial biomass (µg C_{mic} g^{-1} C) and microbial specific respiration (µg O_2 µg^{-1} C_{mic} h^{-1}) with soil depth (litter and 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil) in five forest types (European beech [Be], Douglas-fir [Do], Douglas-fir with beech [Do/Be], Norway spruce [Sp] and Norway spruce with beech [Sp/Be]) at nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. Points and horizontal bars represent means and standard errors (n=4). The grey vertical bars represent respective values in beech forests at nutrient-poor sites in litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil depth. Note log scale for microbial biomass.

Figure 4. Changes in stress indicators (ratio of cyclopropyl fatty acids to its precursors, ratio of saturated to monounsaturated fatty acids and ratio of Gram-positive to Gram-negative bacteria [cy/pre, sat/mono and Gram+/Gram-, respectively]) with soil depth (litter and 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil) in five forest types (European beech [Be], Douglas-fir [Do], Douglas-fir with beech [Do/Be], Norway spruce [Sp] and Norway spruce with beech [Sp/Be]) at nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites. Points and horizontal bars represent means and standard errors (n=4). The grey vertical bars represent respective values in beech forests at nutrient-poor sites in litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm depth.

Figure 5. Principal component analysis of the microbial community structure (as indicated by phospholipid-derived fatty acids) in five forest types (European beech [Be], Douglas-fir [Do], Douglas-fir with beech [Do/Be], Norway spruce [Sp] and Norway spruce with beech [Sp/Be]) at nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites in litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil depth. Positions of forest types represent centroids (n=4). Nutrient-poor sites are given in red and nutrient-rich sites in green. C/N and pH were post-fitted into the plot.

Table 1. F- and P-values of linear mixed effects models on the effect of Forest type (European beech, Douglas-fir, Norway spruce, mixture of European beech with Douglas-fir and mixture of European beech with Norway spruce), Quintet group (nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich sites) and Depth (litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm) on (a) basal respiration, microbial biomass and microbial specific respiration, (b) stress indicators (cy/pre, sat/mono, $Gram^+/Gram^-$ ratios) and (c) percentages of fungal, bacteria, and fungi/bacteria ratio. Significant effects are given in bold ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2. Results of (a) two-way MANOVAs and (b) MANCOVA of PLFA composition in litter, 0–5 and 5–10 cm soil. Factors include Forest type (European beech, Douglas-fir, Norway spruce and mixture of European beech with Douglas-fir and mixture of European beech with Norway spruce), Quintet group (nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor sites) and their interactions. MANOVA was based on principal components from each sample depth (significant PCs were determined by broken stick criterion; see Methods). Type I sum of square

was used for models without soil parameters, and type II sum of squares for those with soil parameters. Significant effects are given in bold ($p < 0.05$).

743 Figure 1



744

745 Figure 2



746

747 Figure 3



748

749 Figure 4



750

Figure 5


Litter
PC1 28 %
PC2 23 %
Poor sites
Rich sites
C/N
pH
Sp
Do
Sp/Be
Do/Be
Be
0-5 cm
PC1 25 %
PC2 15 %
Poor sites
Rich sites
C/N
pH
Sp/Be
Sp
Do/Be
Do
Be


5-10 cm
PC1 22 %
PC2 18 %
Poor sites
Rich sites
pH
C/N
Do/Be
Be
Sp/Be
Sp
Do

Table 1

(a)	Basal respiration			Microbial biomass			Specific respiration		
Factor	df	F	P	df	F	P	df	F	P
Forest type (F)	4,24	7.51	**<0.001**	4,30	6.03	**0.001**	4,24	0.92	0.47
Quintet group (Q)	1,6	3.27	0.12	1,30	16.06	**<0.001**	1,6	0.52	0.49
Depth (D)	2,78	181.58	**<0.001**	2,78	231.82	**<0.001**	2,78	17.37	**<0.001**
F × Q	4,24	8.83	**<0.001**	4,30	4.54	**0.006**	4,24	2.36	0.08
(b)	cy/pre ratio			sat/mono ratio			$Gram^+/Gram^-$ ratio		
Factor	df	F	P	df	F	P	df	F	P
Forest type (F)	4,24	2.75	0.052	4,24	8.278	**<0.001**	4,24	3.39	**<0.001**
Quintet group (Q)	1,6	3.48	0.11	1,6	0.195	0.67	1,6	8.17	**0.030**
Depth (D)	2,68	238.82	**<0.001**	2,76	5.551	**0.006**	2,76	228.51	**<0.001**
F × Q	4,24	2.70	0.055	4,24	3.650	**0.019**	4,24	2.27	**0.012**
Q × D	2,68	6.20	**0.003**	2,76	10.71	**<0.001**	2,76	7.51	**0.001**
F × D	8,68	3.72	**0.001**	-	-	-	-	-	-
(c)	% Fungi			% Bacteria			Fungi/Bacteria ratio		
Factor	df	F	P	df	F	P	df	F	P
Forest type (F)	4,30	1.77	0.16	4,30	2.19	0.094	4,24	0.83	0.52
Quintet group (Q)	1,30	6.46	**0.02**	1,30	4.34	**0.046**	1,6	4.98	0.07
Depth (D)	2,68	982.11	**<0.001**	2,78	149.47	**<0.001**	2,78	623.37	**<0.001**
F × Q	4,30	1.99	0.12	4,30	0.733	0.58	4,24	1.60	0.21
Q × D	2,68	3.61	**0.002**	-	-	-	-	-	-
F × D	8,68	18.54	**<0.001**	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2

Soil depths	Factors	(a) Without soil parameters df	Wilk's lambda	F	P	(b) With soil parameters df	Wilk's lambda	F	P
Litter	Forest type (F)	4,30	0.32	3.29	**0.001**	4,28	0.42	2.23	**0.019**
	Quintet group (Q)	1,30	0.42	12.77	**<0.001**	1,28	0.61	5.57	**0.004**
	F × Q	4,30	0.73	0.77	0.677	4,28	0.74	0.69	0.757
	pH	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.75	2.85	0.057
	C/N	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.82	1.95	0.146
0–5 cm	Forest type (F)	4,30	0.19	2.80	**0.001**	4,28	0.34	1.57	0.081
	Quintet group (Q)	1,30	0.39	8.14	**<0.001**	1,28	0.80	1.18	0.350
	F × Q	4,30	0.36	1.57	0.078	4,28	0.31	1.68	0.054
	pH	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.47	5.41	**0.002**
	C/N	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.66	2.44	0.063
5–10 cm	Forest type (F)	4,30	0.41	1.76	0.051	4,28	0.45	1.45	0.142
	Quintet group (Q)	1,30	0.45	8.15	**<0.001**	1,28	0.82	1.34	0.285
	F × Q	4,30	0.69	0.68	0.805	4,28	0.74	0.51	0.936
	pH	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.84	1.22	0.326
	C/N	-	-	-	-	1,28	0.75	2.08	0.114