Next generation restoration metrics: Using soil eDNA bacterial community data to

measure trajectories towards rehabilitation targets

Author details:

Craig Liddicoat[1,2], Siegfried L. Krauss[3,4], Andrew Bissett[5], Ryan J. Borrett[6], Luisa C.

Ducki[1,6], Shawn D. Peddle[1], Paul Bullock[7], Mark P. Dobrowolski[4,8,11], Andrew Grigg[9], Mark

Tibbett[4,10], Martin F. Breed[1]

[1]College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

[2]School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia

[3]Kings Park Science, Western Australia Department of Biodiversity Conservation and

Attractions, Perth, Australia.

[4]School of Biological Sciences, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

[5]CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Hobart, Australia

[6]College of Science, Health, Engineering and Education, Murdoch University, Perth,

Australia

[7]South32 Worsley Alumina, Perth, Australia

[8]Iluka Resources Limited, Perth, Australia

[9]Alcoa of Australia Limited, Perth, Australia

[10]Department of Sustainable Land Management & Soil Research Centre, School of

Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Berkshire, United Kingdom

[11]Harry Butler Institute, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia

Correspondence:

Craig Liddicoat, College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Sturt Road

Bedford Park SA 5042, Adelaide, Australia

Email: craig.liddicoat@flinders.edu.au

Abstract

1. Soil microbiota are fundamentally linked to the restoration of degraded ecosystems, as they are central to important ecological functions including the support of plant communities. High throughput sequencing of environmental DNA used to characterise soil microbiota offers promise to monitor ecological progress towards reference states. In post-mining rehabilitation, successful mine closure planning requires specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) completion criteria, such as returning ecological communities to match a target level of similarity to reference sites.

2. We analysed patterns of surface soil bacterial community similarity to reference ('rehabilitation trajectory') data from three long-term (> 25 year) post-mining rehabilitation chronosequence case studies from south-west Western Australia. We examined the influence of different ecological distance measures, sequence grouping approaches, and eliminating rare taxa on rehabilitation trajectories and predicted recovery times. We also explored the issue of spatial autocorrelation in our rehabilitation trajectory assessments and trialled a first-pass approach for correcting its undue influence.

3. We found considerable variation in bacterial communities among reference sites within each case study minesite, providing valuable context for setting targets and evaluating recovery. Median Bray-Curtis similarities among references within each minesite ranged from 30–36%, based on amplicon sequence variant-level data. Median predicted times for rehabilitated sites to recover to these levels ranged from around 40 to over 100 years. We discuss strengths and limitations of the different approaches and offer recommendations to improve the robustness of this assessment method.

4. *Synthesis and applications.* We demonstrate a proof-of-concept, complexity-reducing application of soil eDNA sequence-based surveys of bacterial communities in restoration chronosequence studies to quantitatively assess progress towards reference communities

and corresponding rehabilitation targets. Our method provides a step towards developing

microbiota-based SMART metrics for measuring rehabilitation success in post-mining,

and potentially other, restoration contexts. Our approach enables prediction of recovery

time, explicitly including uncertainty in assessments, and assists examination of potential

barriers to ecological recovery, including biologically-associated variation in soil

properties.

KEYWORDS:

Beta diversity, ecological distance, eDNA, mine closure assessment, restoration genomics,

rehabilitation trajectory, soil microbiota, spatial autocorrelation

1. INTRODUCTION

Land degradation and transformation, with negative impacts to biodiversity and ecosystem function, is estimated to impact 75% of the Earth's land surface, and this figure is projected to rise to over 90% by 2050 (IPBES 2018). Ecological restoration—activity that supports rehabilitation of locally representative, sustainable, biodiverse ecosystems (Gann *et al.* 2019)—is seen as integral to reversing these impacts, as highlighted by the UN declaration of 2021–2030 as the Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (https://www.decadeonrestoration.org/). Restoration is technically challenging and requires considerable investment, without guaranteed success (Tibbett 2015). With large investments in restoration (e.g. Menz, Dixon & Hobbs 2013 estimate US$18 billion/yr is required to restore degraded lands globally; BenDor *et al.* 2015 estimate US$9.5 billion/yr is spent in the USA alone), there is a need to improve the evidence base to guide continuous improvement in restoration outcomes and to underpin future investment.

Reference ecosystems provide an important basis for establishing targets and monitoring progress of restoration activities (Gann *et al.* 2019) (SI Appendix, Figure S1). In post-mining contexts, best practice guidelines require formal mine completion criteria to be prescribed in a matter that is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) (Australian_Government 2016; Manero, Standish & Young 2021). To-date, completion criteria have largely focussed on vegetation community variables, with typical ecological measures including alpha and beta diversity reflecting the number of different taxa and community composition, respectively. For example, targets may be set at a minimum threshold similarity to a reference community. Despite available guidance, many completion criteria are ambiguous or ill-defined, and can result in unclear standards for regulators, unrealistic expectations for stakeholders, and represent a key barrier to the relinquishment of minesites (Manero, Standish & Young 2021). To help move the industry towards improved

definitions of completion criteria, Manero, Standish and Young (2021) suggest criteria for

industry best practice, which include using multiple reference sites, monitoring and corrective

actions (i.e., adaptive management), allowing innovation-guided completion criteria, and

specific objectives and indicators.

Soil microbial communities (microbiota) have essential roles in organic matter

decomposition, soil formation, and nutrient cycling, and therefore help regulate plant

productivity and community dynamics (Harris 2009). Patterns of land use, vegetation

communities, and soil quality each help to shape soil microbiota (Bulgarelli *et al.* 2013;

Turner *et al.* 2013; Delgado-Baquerizo *et al.* 2018). Microbiota depend on the resource and

energy flows associated with aboveground biota, and therefore their monitoring may help

indicate the impact of restoration interventions (Harris 2009; Jiao *et al.* 2018; van der Heyde

et al. 2020).

The development of low-cost, high-throughput sequencing of environmental DNA

(eDNA) has enabled affordable, rapid and comprehensive assessment of soil microbiota.

Applying recognised ecological assessment approaches to abundant eDNA-based microbiota

data has potential to provide a novel tool for measuring trajectories and predicting time to

recover towards restoration targets (Rydgren *et al.* 2019). Chronosequence study designs,

while containing limitations (Walker *et al.* 2010), are commonly used to examine ecosystem

recovery following restoration activities (Tibbett 2010). However, there are few studies of

soil microbiota from restoration chronosequences that explicitly visualise and evaluate

patterns in ecological similarity to reference data with time since rehabilitation. It is

customary for such studies (e.g., Jiao *et al.* 2018; Schmid *et al.* 2020) to examine patterns in

microbiota composition via analysis of taxonomic groups and ordination techniques which

project multivariate community data into lower dimensional space (e.g. 2-d plots). These

techniques often characterise the complexity and site-specificity of soil ecosystems.

However, a focus on measuring 'similarity to reference' may help cut through the complexity

inherent to microbiota data. Along these lines, van der Heyde *et al.* (2020) visualised

temporal trends in ecological similarity to reference data in post-mining rehabilitation—

however, each rehabilitation sample was only compared to a single closest reference sample,

which potentially limited insight into variability and uncertainty in microbiota recovery.

Here we conduct a detailed exploration of a complexity-reducing application of

eDNA-based soil bacterial community data to assess post-mining rehabilitation in three long-

term (> 25 year) chronosequence case studies from south-west Western Australia.

Specifically, we aim to demonstrate the use of chronosequence-based rehabilitation

trajectories, using measures of percent similarity to ecological reference sites (hereafter

termed references), to assess progress of soil bacterial communities towards reference states

with increasing rehabilitation age. We note that further work that links microbiota to other

ecosystem components (e.g., vegetation, fauna) is important but beyond the scope of our

study.

Our *a priori* research questions were: (1) Can soil bacterial community data be used

to establish reference-based targets? (2) Can soil bacterial community rehabilitation

trajectory data be used to predict the time to recover to reference targets? (3) How are these

predictions of recovery influenced by different ecological distance/similarity measures and

sequence data resolution? For example, grouping bacterial taxa based on sequence similarity

might help reduce noise associated with DNA sequencing methods; taxonomic grouping

might assist interpretation if recognised groups can be discussed; and eliminating rare taxa (to

simulate reduced sequencing depths) might allow more cost-effective and rapid analyses. We

also recognise the potential for spatial autocorrelation—where measured outcomes are closer

in value due to closer spatial proximity—to confound the assessment of rehabilitation age in

chronosequence studies that lack appropriate spatial design and replication. Therefore, we

also undertake a preliminary, illustrative examination of spatial autocorrelation, and trial a

first-pass approach to highlight, and correct for, its excessive influence. We then discuss

limitations and synthesise our findings to inform future work.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1   Data collection

We used surface soil bacterial 16S rRNA marker gene data from three case study minesites

(Figure 1; online Supporting Information (SI) Appendix, Tables S1–S3) from south-west

Western Australia. Soil sampling was undertaken in accordance with Australian Microbiome

(AM) protocols (Bissett *et al.* 2016; https://www.australianmicrobiome.com/protocols; SI

Appendix, Supplementary Methods). Each minesite experiences a Mediterranean-type

climate with hot, dry summers and cool, wet winters. Post-mining rehabilitation activities

typically involved deep-ripping, prior to the 'direct return' (where possible) of subsoil and

topsoil stripped from a separate pit about to be mined, followed by revegetation with locally

appropriate seed of diverse plant communities (Tibbett 2010). Precise soil handling and

storage techniques differed between the minesites and different pits within minesites.

Summary information for each minesite is provided below (see SI Appendix, Supplementary

Methods for more background information; other studies in-progress will provide expanded

analyses of surface and subsoil data from these minesites, including additional marker gene

datasets).

Alcoa's *Huntly* bauxite-producing minesite is approximately 100 km south-east of

Perth, occurring in mixed open forest with dominant overstorey species of Jarrah (*Eucalyptus*

marginata) and Marri (*Corymbia calophylla*) on lateritic, nutrient poor soils. We consider

Huntly data sampled in 2016, with rehabilitation ages between 2–29 years old. Huntly's 36

samples correspond to rehabilitation years: 1987 (n = 3), 1991 (n = 3), 1999 (n = 3), 2002 (n

= 3), 2008 (n = 3), 2014 (n = 3), reference (n = 18), where each reference site was paired with

an adjacent rehabilitation site. Iluka Resource's *Eneabba* mineral-sand minesite is

approximately 280 km north of Perth, occurring in sandplain heath vegetation comprising

low shrubland on undulating infertile siliceous sandplains, predominantly featuring perennial

woody species from the Proteaceae, Myrtaceae, and Fabaceae families. We consider Eneabba

data sampled in 2019, with rehabilitation ages between 7–38 years. Eneabba's 26 samples

correspond to rehabilitation years: 1981 (n = 3), 1989 (n = 2), 1995 (n = 3), 2000 (n = 2),

2004 (n = 3), 2009 (n = 2), 2012 (n = 2), reference (n = 9). South32's *Worsley* bauxite-

producing minesite is located approximately 150 km south of Perth, occurring in Jarrah

(*Eucalyptus marginata*) forest on lateritic, nutrient poor soils. We consider Worsley data

sampled in 2019, with rehabilitation ages between 2–28 years old. Worsley's 25 samples

correspond to rehabilitation years: 1991 (n = 2), 1996 (n = 4), 1999 (n = 2), 2002 (n = 2),

2005 (n = 2), 2007 (n = 1), 2011 (n = 3), 2017 (n = 3), reference (n = 6). Each soil sample

had physico-chemical analyses performed at CSBP Laboratories (Perth, Western Australia) to

quantify key soil abiotic variables as prescribed by AM protocols, including soil texture,

organic carbon, ammonium, potassium, sulphur, calcium, pH, nitrate, phosphorous, and

electrical conductivity.

FIGURE 1. Locations of minesites and soil sampling sites: (A) Huntly, (B) Eneabba,

(C) Worsley. (Imagery: Sentinel-2; https://eos.com/landviewer; EOS Data Analytics, Inc.)

2.2   eDNA sequencing, bioinformatics, and data preparation

DNA extraction, PCR and preliminary bioinformatic analyses were undertaken in accordance

with AM workflows (Bissett *et al.* 2016; see SI Appendix, Supplementary Methods). From

this workflow, denoised 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequence variant (ASV) level abundance

data were produced for all minesites. Note, in this study ASVs are equivalent to zero radius

operational taxonomic units (zOTUs). Further data preparation and analyses were largely

undertaken in R version 4.0.3 (R-Core-Team 2020) utilising the framework of the R phyloseq

package (McMurdie & Holmes 2013) to manage the datasets (see SI Appendix

Supplementary Methods for number of sequences and ASVs studied in each minesite, initial

data cleaning steps, and preparation of phylogenetic trees).

2.3   Data visualisation and statistical analyses

We visualised the sequence depth of samples using rarefaction curves (SI Appendix, Figure

S2). For the majority of subsequent analyses, we normalised the sequence data for sampling

effort by rarefying abundances of ASVs, and other taxonomic levels investigated below, to

the minimum sample sequence depth within respective minesites (Huntly, n = 17,485

sequences; Eneabba, n = 10,142 sequences; Worsley, n = 54,122 sequences) using the

rarefy_even_depth() function from R phyloseq. For ASV-level data, the total rarefied

sequences comprised at Huntly, n = 629,460 sequences (30,751 ASVs); Eneabba, 263,692

sequences (27,115 ASVs); and Worsley, 1,353,050 sequences (54,327 ASVs). Exploratory

data analyses to visualise ASV alpha diversity, evenness, and relative abundance via

heatmaps of phyla, classes, and orders in each minesite are presented in the SI Appendix,

Supplementary Methods, and Figures S3–S13. Exploratory data analyses also included

preliminary visualisations of soil and landscape variables that associated with the soil

bacterial community samples within each minesite (refer to SI Appendix Supplementary

Methods, Supplementary Data, Figures S14–20).

We examined a range of alternative qualitative and quantitative beta diversity

measures (i.e., ecological distance or community dissimilarity, converted to similarity) to

model rehabilitation trajectories and time to reach reference targets (described below). For

the minesite with the largest number of samples (Huntly), we also investigated data pre-

processing options of grouping by sequence similarity, taxonomic grouping, and excluding

rare taxa. Details of the number of taxa considered and percentage of sequences remaining

after grouping, rarefying, and exclusions (see below) are indicated in the SI Appendix, Table

S4.

224   2.3.1   Alternative ecological distance measures

225   For each minesite, we used the cleaned and rarefied ASV-level bacterial community data to

226   derive ecological distance matrices using distance measures commonly employed in

227   microbiota studies—i.e., Jaccard, Bray-Curtis, Unweighted UniFrac and Weighted UniFrac

228   (Lozupone *et al.* 2007)—via the *vegdist()* function from the R vegan package (Oksanen *et al.*

229   2020).

231   2.3.2   Grouping by sequence similarity

232   For Huntly data only, separate R phyloseq objects were generated to represent soil bacterial

233   community data with sequences clustered into 99%, 97%, 95%, and 90% identity OTUs (see

234   SI Appendix, Supplementary Methods). For these analyses, OTUs were formed, abundance

235   data were rarefied, and then Jaccard and Bray-Curtis distances were calculated.

237   2.3.3   Taxonomic grouping

For Huntly data only, we examined the influence of taxonomic grouping (i.e., ASV, genus,

family, order, class, and phylum) on the assessments of recovery. We also tested the

influence of discarding versus retaining (at the next available classified grouping) taxa that

were unclassified at each taxonomic rank, which we termed 'pruned' and 'non-pruned' data

respectively. Grouping was undertaken using *tax_glom()*; and in 'pruned' datasets,

unclassified taxa were removed using *prune_taxa()* from R phyloseq. For these analyses, taxa

were grouped, abundance data were rarefied, then Jaccard and Bray-Curtis distances were

calculated. Richness and evenness of sequences at the order, class and phylum level were

also visualised based on rarefied data and plotted together with composite estimates within

rehabilitation age groups from merged-sample bootstrap resampling (Liddicoat *et al.* 2019)

(B=100).

2.3.4   Excluding rare taxa

For Huntly data only, we examined the influence of excluding rare taxa, by considering all

ASVs, then ASVs with >0.001 %, > 0.01%, and > 0.1% relative abundance within each

minesite. For these analyses, ASVs with below the respective relative abundance threshold

were removed, abundance data were rarefied, then Jaccard and Bray-Curtis measures were

calculated.

2.3.5   Rehabilitation trajectory modelling

The rehabilitation trajectory analyses presented here were derived from a subset of data

contained in the abovementioned ecological distance matrices. Specifically, only pairwise

distances between samples and reference samples were considered (including distances

among reference samples within minesites). Data were then expressed as percent similarity

values (i.e., $100 \times (1 - \text{distance})$ [%]). Rehabilitation trajectory boxplots were then generated

from the series of similarity to reference data on the y-axis and increasing rehabilitation age

on the x-axis, concluding with reference samples (e.g., see Figure 2B). Testing for

differences in similarities to reference at each rehabilitation age (as visualised with boxplots)

was performed using the Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, followed by post-hoc Dunn tests for

multiple comparisons, with Bonferroni adjusted threshold *P*-values. The multiple comparison

testing used default two-sided *P*-values and alpha = 0.05 nominal level of significance.

FIGURE 2. Example data for the Huntly minesite chronosequence soil bacterial

communities. (A) NMDS ordination to visualise beta diversity or compositional differences

based on ASV-level data and Bray-Curtis distances. (B) Rehabilitation trajectory boxplots

express a trend in ecological similarity to references with increasing rehabilitation age. The

similarity data in (B) are based on a subset of the distance matrix data that underpins (A), i.e.

(B) uses only those distances that involve reference samples, and the value is expressed as

similarity to reference (%). Groups not sharing letters are significantly different. Note the x-

axis is presented here as a categorical (not numerical) scale. Sample sizes for the

rehabilitation age groups (used to produce distance data) are described in section 2.1.

After observing the variation in similarity to reference values among references

within each minesite (e.g., Figure 2B), we defined rehabilitation targets for the purpose of

this study as the median (= the central value) of among-reference similarities. This target

median value varied by minesite, distance/similarity measure, and pre-processing option. We

predicted the time to reach a restoration target (= recovery time) by modelling the trend in

similarity to reference with increasing rehabilitation age using bootstrapped (B = 100)

logarithmic models. The median, 5th and 95th percentile of predicted recovery time were

evaluated. Our use of logarithmic models was consistent with the approach of Rydgren *et al.*

(2019), except we used ecological similarity not distance measures. Each iteration of the

bootstrap involved random sampling with replacement from the available chronosequence

similarity to reference data, excluding outliers identified via the *boxplot()* function in base R,

and developing a predictive logarithmic model for similarity to reference out to a maximum

rehabilitation age of 500 years, or until the target was reached. Models that failed to reach the

target were reported with a prediction time of '>500 years'. Rectangular hyperbola and

negative exponential models were also trialled but were abandoned after many cases failed to

produce model fits.

2.3.6   Exploring spatial autocorrelation

To explore the influence of spatial autocorrelation on our trajectory analyses, we produced

variogram-like plots with ecological distance (i.e., Jaccard, Bray-Curtis; between samples

and references) on the y-axis, and geographic distances (between samples and references) on

the x-axis. Each rehabilitation age group was modelled as a second-order polynomial,

allowing the possible expression of curvilinear trendlines that mimicked variogram-like

relationships (i.e., increasing then flattening). Assuming reference curves offered a natural

baseline trend for spatial autocorrelation within each minesite environment, we applied a

'correction' to the curvilinear trendline for each rehabilitation age group by calculating the

difference in mean-centred model curves (= rehabilitation age group minus reference), such

that 'corrected' data for rehabilitation age groups expressed the same ecological distance-

geographic distance curvilinear trend as seen for references (see SI Appendix Supplementary

Methods for further details of the rationale and approach for this preliminary analysis).

Rehabilitation trajectories and predicted recovery times were compared between 'original'

and 'corrected' data, considering Jaccard and Bray-Curtis similarities. For the Worsley

minesite, a 'filtered' dataset, and corresponding correction, were also prepared which

excluded the three southernmost samples, which were geographically separate from the other

Worsley samples (see Figure 1, and SI Appendix Table S3).

3. RESULTS

3.1 General findings

We found remarkable variability among reference samples within each minesite (Figure 3; SI

Appendix, Table S5, Figures S21–S23). Among-reference similarities ranged from <20% to

>95% depending on ecological measures, pre-processing, and minesite. All rehabilitation

trajectory plots displayed the general pattern of increasing similarity to references with

increasing rehabilitation age (Figure 3; SI Appendix, Figures S21–S23), although the

logarithmic models and predicted recovery times varied by ecological measures, pre-

processing and minesite.

3.2   Alternative ecological measures

We found a general increase in similarity to reference values across the ecological measures, from Jaccard (generally lowest similarities), Bray-Curtis, Unweighted UniFrac, to Weighted UniFrac (generally highest similarities) (Figure 3; SI Appendix, Table S5). The greatest y-axis span, and therefore greatest sensitivity to detect change, in similarity to reference values between the youngest rehabilitation ages and references occurred with Bray-Curtis measures (Figure 3). The smallest span (or flattest curves) in similarity to reference values between the youngest rehabilitation ages and references occurred with Weighted UniFrac measures.

Except for the Unweighted Unifrac result at Huntly, Jaccard measures generally returned the longest predicted recovery times, followed by reduced or similar recovery times predicted using Bray-Curtis, Unweighted Unifrac and Weighted UniFrac measures (Figure 4; SI Appendix, Table S6). Low sample sizes (and corresponding low numbers of distance measures) represent a limitation in our analysis, and the ecologically-distant samples in the 17-year and 25-year rehabilitation age group at Huntly (Figure 2A) are likely contributing to the reduced similarity and longer rehabilitation trajectory in Unweighted UniFrac data. These 17-year and 25-year rehabilitation age group data at Huntly express reduced alpha diversity and evenness compared to other samples, however reasons for this are unclear (SI Appendix, Figures S3–S4).

FIGURE 3. Rehabilitation trajectory plots based on surface soil bacterial community

similarity to reference samples, for the Huntly, Eneabba, and Worsley minesites. Boxplots

display the distribution of similarity values across rehabilitation ages (groups not sharing a

letter are significantly different). Blue dotted lines denote the median similarity among

references. Red lines represent logarithmic models for the change in similarity to reference

with rehabilitation age, based on bootstrap resampling and modelling (B=100).

FIGURE 4. Predicted recovery times for soil bacterial ASVs to reach the target similarity to

reference (= median of among-reference similarity values), for Huntly, Enneabba, and

Worsley, considering Jaccard, Bray-Curtis, Unweighted- and Weighted-UniFrac measures,

based on bootstrap (B=100) logarithmic models (see SI Appendix, Table S6 for values).

3.3   Grouping by sequence similarity (Huntly only)

Grouping by sequence similarity resulted in progressive overall shifts towards increasing

similarity to reference values from ASV-level (generally lowest similarities), 99%, 97%,

95%, to 90%-identity OTUs (generally highest similarities) (SI Appendix, Figure S21).

Predicted recovery times with more broadly clustered OTUs followed continuous and

seemingly predictable patterns of: (i) increasing recovery times with Jaccard measures, and

(ii) decreasing to steadying recovery times with Bray-Curtis measures (SI Appendix, Figure

S24A, Table S6).

3.4   Taxonomic grouping (Huntly only)

Moving from ASV to genus-level data resulted in a pronounced shift towards increasing

similarity to reference, with similar although somewhat flatter rehabilitation trajectory curves

at higher taxonomic groupings (SI Appendix, Figure S22). Visually, there appeared to be

little effect on the rehabilitation trajectory plots from pruning unclassified taxa (SI Appendix,

Figure S22). Using Jaccard measures, moving from ASV-level to grouping at genus-level or

higher groupings dramatically increased predicted recovery times, compared to other

measures (SI Appendix, Figure S24B, Table S6). Also, pruning of unclassified groups

reduced the smoothness or continuity in Jaccard predicted recovery times (SI Appendix,

Figure S24B). Using Bray-Curtis measures, we found a non-linear pattern of recovery times

across the taxonomic groupings, with shorter times to reach the target in genus, family, and

order-level groups, and longer recovery times in other groupings (SI Appendix, Figure S24B;

see SI Appendix, Figures S5–S13 for relative abundance of order, class, and phylum-level

taxa for each minesite). Richness and evenness of bacterial communities varied across

rehabilitation age groups and taxonomic groupings (e.g., data for phylum, class, and order-

level are shown in SI Appendix, Figure S25), which may help explain the somewhat erratic

results from taxonomic grouping.

3.5   Excluding rare taxa (Huntly only)

Removing rare taxa to the point of retaining ASVs with >0.01% relative abundance produced

results from the Jaccard analysis that appeared to mimic results from the Bray-Curtis analysis

(SI Appendix, Figure S23). When only more common ASVs with >0.1% relative abundance

were retained, both the Jaccard and Bray-Curtis results appeared to reflect over-simplified

communities, resulting in shorter predicted recovery times. However, including only ASVs

with >0.001% relative abundance produced a small increase in predicted recovery times for

both Jaccard and Bray-Curtis (SI Appendix, Figure S24C, Table S6).

3.6   Young rehabilitation sites with 'direct return' soils

During our analyses, we uncovered example data that highlighted a distorting influence on

our trajectory modelling from young rehabilitation sites with 'direct return' soils.

Specifically, these fresher soil materials were more similar to references than older

rehabilitation sites. At Eneabba and Worsley, we compared trajectories with and without the

youngest rehabilitation age groups (i.e., excluding 7-year old sites at Eneabba; and 2-year old

sites and associated reference X138404 at Worsley) (SI Appendix, Figure S26–S29; Table

S6). Excluding these samples reduced predicted recovery times, e.g., for Bray-Curtis

similarities from median (and 5th percentile, 95th percentile) values of 94 (69, 131) years to 60

(53, 71) years at Eneabba; and from 104 (69, 174) to 41 (36, 47) years at Worsley.

3.7   Correcting for spatial autocorrelation

We modelled the slope-trends of the relationships between ecological distance to references

and geographic distance to references, within rehabilitation age classes, for each of the

minesites with Bray-Curtis and Jaccard measures (see SI Appendix, Figures S30–S35). We

also applied a 'correction' for the spatial autocorrelation, such that rehabilitation age groups

were adjusted to display the same ecological-geographic slope trend as found in references

(refer to the 'C' panels in SI Appendix, Figures S30–S35). Rehabilitation trajectory plots, and

predicted recovery times, using these corrected data were compared to the original

uncorrected data (see SI Appendix, Figures S36–S37 and Table S6). Worsley displayed a

strong ecological distance-geographic distance trend in among-reference data (= spatial

autocorrelation), and the greatest divergence of all the minesites in predicted recovery times

between original and corrected data (SI Appendix, Figure S36–S37). However, with

exclusion of the southernmost Worsley samples (i.e., the filtered dataset), the spatial

autocorrelation signal disappeared and predicted recovery times for filtered-original and

filtered-corrected data displayed comparable distributions (SI Appendix, Figure S38–S40,

Table S6).

4.   DISCUSSION

4.1   Alternative ecological measures

Bray-Curtis measures produced the greatest range in similarity values between young

rehabilitation and reference samples, and therefore are likely to offer the greatest sensitivity

to quantify the progress of recovery of soil bacterial communities towards reference states. In

contrast, Weighted UniFrac offered limited sensitivity to detect changes with rehabilitation

age (i.e., shallow trajectory curves) and may result in under-prediction of recovery times.

Low variation in Weighted Unifrac similarities likely reflects high proportions of somewhat

closely related organisms across the samples. Jaccard distances represent the proportion of

unshared taxa out of the total number of taxa recorded in two groups (Anderson, Ellingsen &

McArdle 2006). Unweighted UniFrac uses phylogenetic information and calculates the

fraction of the branch length in a phylogenetic tree that leads to descendants in either, but not

both, of the two communities (Lozupone *et al.* 2007). These qualitative measures reflect the

survival and presence of taxa (Jaccard) and related lineages (Unweighted UniFrac), where

loss of sequences can reflect extreme or limiting environmental conditions (e.g., soil abiotic

factors) or limited geographic distribution. Meanwhile, Bray-Curtis and Weighted UniFrac

measures emphasise abundant organisms (or abundant sequences). Similarity generally

increased with increasing abundances of shared taxa for Bray-Curtis, and shared lineages of

related sequences for Weighted UniFrac. The quantitative measures often reflect the growth

or decline of certain organisms due to factors such as nutrient availability and sublethal

variation in environmental conditions (Lozupone *et al.* 2007).

4.2   Grouping by sequence similarity

Grouping near identical sequences will reduce the denominator used in calculating Jaccard distances. For a given number of unshared taxa between samples, using broader OTU clusters will make the proportion of unshared taxa (compared to all taxa) larger when there are a smaller number of total taxa present. Our data suggest this shifting Jaccard calculation can impact some samples strongly (e.g., note the 17-year age group in SI Appendix, Figure S21) resulting in a gradual increase in predicted recovery times with broader (reduced identity threshold) OTU clusters. On the other hand, broader OTU clusters will aggregate some sequences into already large groups and will tend to further emphasise abundant groups. Consequently, our Bray-Curtis data suggest broader OTU clustering will make the target similarity easier to reach and predicted recovery times reduced accordingly.

4.3   Taxonomic grouping

We do not recommend grouping 16S rRNA data by taxonomy to quantify recovery in soil bacterial communities due to the erratic behaviour of predicted recovery times.

4.4   Excluding rare taxa

We show that filtering out of rare taxa to a limited extent (>0.001% relative sequence abundance) produces a relatively small increase in predicted recovery times for both Jaccard and Bray-Curtis measures. Interestingly, this low level of exclusion of rare taxa does not appear to moderate the assessment by producing reduced recovery times. At the low level of exclusion, our analysis using rarefied data and similarity to reference measures may help mitigate some of the impacts and concerns of removal of rare sequences experienced

elsewhere (e.g., Schloss 2020). This raises the prospect to reduce sequencing depth, and

potential for shifting investment towards more robust assessments that incorporate a larger

number of samples with reduced sequencing depth and cost per sample.

4.5   Influence of 'direct return' soils in young rehabilitation sites

For reasons discussed here and below, we suggest it may be prudent for future similarity to

reference trajectory assessments to exclude young rehabilitation sites with 'direct return' soils

that display elevated similarity to reference. As observed at Eneabba and Worsley, the

inclusion of young rehabilitation samples that were overly similar to references resulted in

seemingly biased, longer predictions of recovery time. The industry best practice of 'direct

return' of topsoil to new rehabilitation sites is based on objectives to minimise soil

degradation and expedite ecosystem recovery. However, our use of monotonic logarithmic

models applied to a data series that contains young rehabilitation sites with elevated

similarity to reference values, followed by older sites with reduced similarity to reference

values, results in the seemingly perverse outcome of a flatter, longer modelled trajectory of

recovery. The enhanced ecological similarity to reference in young rehabilitation sites with

'direct return' soils reflects a biological inertia, or temporary carryover effect, from unmined

areas where the soils originate, and confounds the relationship between soil microbiota

development and rehabilitation age. For 'direct return' soils, we speculate the time taken for

local influences to become dominant in shaping the resident microbiota may be in the order

of 1-10 years, varying on a case-by-case basis, e.g., due to soil factors including organic

matter and clay content, as well as the magnitude of environmental influences. Soil

microbiota will be shaped by influences including local rainfall, temperature, aspect, soil

water availability and transport (e.g. run-on, lateral flow), and vegetation communities via

plant-soil feedbacks. Existing deeper soil and substrate may also influence rehabilitation

surface soils via upward movement of water, nutrients, and some microbiota through

mechanisms including: hydraulic redistribution by plant root systems (Neumann & Cardon

2012); potential microbiota uptake and transfer via xylem into the phyllosphere (Fausto *et al.*

2018; Deyett & Rolshausen 2019) and subsequent leaf litter; and capillary rise in heavier

textured soils under conditions of soil water evaporation.

Any decision to exclude young rehabilitation sites with direct return soils from the

modelling should be made on a case-by-case basis. In particular, this decision should reflect

whether these data display elevated similarity to reference values; and consider factors such

as the source location of direct return soils (are they taken from sites that are generally closer

to other reference sites or adjacent to rehabilitation sites?), the depth of fresh topsoil applied,

the condition of subsurface layers (e.g., fresh vs stockpiled), and the depth and method of

tillage or mixing of the soil surface following soil return.

4.6   Spatial autocorrelation

Excluding geographic outliers in the filtered Worsley analysis also removed a clear spatial

autocorrelation signal in the data, which indicates the importance of sampling designs. If

rehabilitation sites reflect environmental settings or imported soils that are overly similar or

dissimilar to references (i.e., different to natural background rates of spatial autocorrelation),

this may unduly bias predicted recovery times. Where possible, we recommend a sampling

approach that resembles the approach used at Huntly, where each reference site was spatially

paired with an adjacent rehabilitation site. This approach helps capture variation among

references (within a given minesite) relevant to the broader range of rehabilitation sites; and

provided there is adequate spatial replication and geographic outliers are avoided, then undue

influence from spatial autocorrelation should be avoided.

Our analysis of spatial autocorrelation should be viewed as introductory and

illustrative. For 'direct return' soils at young rehabilitation sites, our approach is deficient

because we do not account for their previous location. Although, we anticipate localised

influences would dominate the shaping of resident soil microbiota in rehabilitation sites after

a few years, as discussed above.

Plant-soil-microbiota feedbacks represent a complicating factor for disentangling

effects of soil abiotic condition, rehabilitation age, and residual/unexplainable spatial

autocorrelation in restoration chronosequence studies. This is because chronosequence

studies (which presume a 'space-for-time' proxy relationship between treatments and

outcomes) typically do not collect sufficient data to determine whether soil conditions have

influenced rehabilitation outcomes, plants have conditioned soils, or both situations have

occurred. Studies that have considered plant-soil feedbacks in restored Jarrah forest (Huntly)

sites have shown differential correlative effects of rehabilitated soil biotic and abiotic

properties (Orozco-Aceves, Tibbett & Standish 2017). Also, plant-soil feedbacks behave

differently in unmined versus rehabilitated soils (Orozco-Aceves, Standish & Tibbett 2015).

Further work is required to build understanding of this topic (e.g., via longitudinal studies).

4.7   Other limitations

There are important limitations in our study, in addition to those already discussed. The

robustness of our study would be improved with more samples per minesite to help better

capture minesite-wide variation. We did not consider soil microbiota patterns at depth, which

are also important. Also, major changes to rehabilitation practices over time will disrupt the

'space-for-time' substitutive modelling approach that is relied upon in chronosequence

studies such as ours. As for restoration chronosequence studies elsewhere, careful sample

selection is required to avoid confounding factors as much as possible (Walker *et al.* 2010).

There are potential limitations in our study associated with the phylogenetic trees we used to

generate UniFrac distances (see SI Appendix, Supplementary Methods for details). Tree-

building often represents a compromise between accuracy in representing phylogenetic

relationships and computing time, and it was beyond the scope of our study to test the

sensitivity of our UniFrac-based analyses to the quality of trees used. We used logarithmic

models which assume a monotonic recovery function, however other models that account for

variable trends over time, and varying success for different rehabilitation techniques or sites,

may offer improved estimates of recovery time. We suggest these limitations should be

investigated in future studies.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We provide a proof-of-concept demonstration of an innovative, chronosequence-based,

similarity to reference trajectory assessment method, to quantitatively track progress in soil

microbiota with post-mining rehabilitation. Through incorporating microbiota survey data

from multiple reference sites of varying character, we revealed substantial variation among

reference ecosystems within each minesite that can inform realistic rehabilitation targets. Our

approach reduces the complexity associated with microbiota data and enables prediction of

recovery time to reach reference-based targets. The use of soil microbiota data (including

alpha diversity, evenness, compositional data, and microbiota-associated soil variables; SI

Appendix, Figures S3–S20) provides another line of evidence, which in conjunction with

other information, could assist in the examination of potential impediments to the progress of

rehabilitation, thereby helping to inform adaptive management. From our investigations, we

recommend using ASV-level Bray-Curtis similarities which appear to offer a relatively

sensitive and stable basis for modelling rehabilitation trajectories. We recommend wherever

possible to maximise sample sizes, employ spatial pairing of reference and rehabilitation

sites; and to exclude geographically-distant, non-representative sampling areas. We also

recommend considering, on a case-by-case basis, the exclusion of young rehabilitation sites

with 'direct return' soils that display elevated similarity to reference values, which may

unduly bias the trajectory modelling. Further fine-tuning to identify possible minor

reductions in sequencing depths (eliminating some rare taxa) offers promise to reduce per

sample costs, enabling investment in more samples, to help deliver more robust assessments.

This work represents an important step towards a reduced-complexity microbiota-based

monitoring and evaluation framework consistent with many best practice principles for

setting, monitoring and managing towards mine completion criteria recommended by

(Manero, Standish & Young 2021). We anticipate that our approach could be expanded to

other eDNA sequence-based survey data (e.g., fungal ITS and eukaryote 18S rRNA marker

genes, functional potential from shotgun metagenomics), and may have broader applicability

for evaluating rehabilitation progress beyond post-mining contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the contribution of the Australian Microbiome consortium in the generation of data used in this publication. The Australian Microbiome is supported by funding from Bioplatforms Australia and the Integrated Marine Observing System (IMOS) through the Australian Government's National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS), Parks Australia through the Bush Blitz program funded by the Australian Government and BHP, and the CSIRO. This research was also supported by the Australian Research Council (LP190100051).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CL, SLK, MT and MFB conceived the ideas and designed the study; SLK, RJB, LCD, PB, MPD, AG collected the data; CL, SLK, AB, MFB analysed and interpreted the data with contributions from all authors; CL led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data and code are available at: https://data.bioplatforms.com/organization/about/australian-microbiome and https://github.com/liddic/resto_traj

ORCID

Craig Liddicoat – https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4812-7524

Siegfried L. Krauss – https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7280-6324

Andrew Bissett – https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7396-1484

Ryan J. Borrett – https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8663-0844

Shawn D. Peddle – https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3464-3058

608   Mark P. Dobrowolski – http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5586-4023

609   Andrew Grigg – https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5818-2973

610   Mark Tibbett – https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0143-2190

611   Martin F. Breed – https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7810-9696

REFERENCES

Anderson, M.J., Ellingsen, K.E. & McArdle, B.H. (2006) Multivariate dispersion as a measure of beta diversity. *Ecology Letters,* **9,** 683-693.

Australian_Government (2016) Mine Rehabilitation: Leading Practice Sustainable Development Program for the Mining Industry.

BenDor, T., Lester, T.W., Livengood, A., Davis, A. & Yonavjak, L. (2015) Estimating the Size and Impact of the Ecological Restoration Economy. *PLoS One,* **10,** e0128339.

Bissett, A., Fitzgerald, A., Meintjes, T., Mele, P.M., Reith, F., Dennis, P.G., Breed, M.F., Brown, B., Brown, M.V., Brugger, J., Byrne, M., Caddy-Retalic, S., Carmody, B., Coates, D.J., Correa, C., Ferrari, B.C., Gupta, V.V.S.R., Hamonts, K., Haslem, A., Hugenholtz, P. & et_al (2016) Introducing BASE: the Biomes of Australian Soil Environments soil microbial diversity database. *GigaScience,* **5,** 21.

Bulgarelli, D., Schlaeppi, K., Spaepen, S., Themaat, E.V.L.v. & Schulze-Lefert, P. (2013) Structure and Functions of the Bacterial Microbiota of Plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biology,* **64,** 807-838.

Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Reith, F., Dennis, P.G., Hamonts, K., Powell, J.R., Young, A., Singh, B.K. & Bissett, A. (2018) Ecological drivers of soil microbial diversity and soil biological networks in the Southern Hemisphere. *Ecology,* **99,** 583-596.

Deyett, E. & Rolshausen, P.E. (2019) Temporal Dynamics of the Sap Microbiome of Grapevine Under High Pierce's Disease Pressure. *Frontiers in Plant Science,* **10**.

Fausto, C., Mininni, A.N., Sofo, A., Crecchio, C., Scagliola, M., Dichio, B. & Xiloyannis, C. (2018) Olive orchard microbiome: characterisation of bacterial communities in soil-plant compartments and their comparison between sustainable and conventional soil management systems. *Plant ecology & diversity,* **11,** 597-610.

Gann, G.D., McDonald, T., Walder, B., Aronson, J., Nelson, C.R., Jonson, J., Hallett, J.G., Eisenberg, C., Guariguata, M.R., Liu, J., Hua, F., Echeverría, C., Gonzales, E., Shaw, N., Decleer, K. & Dixon, K.W. (2019) International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration. Second edition. *Restoration Ecology,* **27,** S1-S46.

Harris, J. (2009) Soil Microbial Communities and Restoration Ecology: Facilitators or Followers? *Science,* **325,** 573-574.

IPBES (2018) The IPBES assessment report on land degradation and restoration. (ed. L. Montanarella, Scholes, R., and Brainich, A. (eds.)), pp. 744. Bonn, Germany.

Jiao, S., Chen, W., Wang, J., Du, N., Li, Q. & Wei, G. (2018) Soil microbiomes with distinct assemblies through vertical soil profiles drive the cycling of multiple nutrients in reforested ecosystems. *Microbiome,* **6,** 146.

Liddicoat, C., Weinstein, P., Bissett, A., Gellie, N., Mills, J., Waycott, M. & Breed, M. (2019) Can bacterial indicators of a grassy woodland restoration inform ecosystem assessment and microbiota-mediated human health? *Environment International,* **129,** 105-117.

Lozupone, C.A., Hamady, M., Kelley, S.T. & Knight, R. (2007) Quantitative and qualitative beta diversity measures lead to different insights into factors that structure microbial communities. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology,* **73,** 1576-1585.

Manero, A., Standish, R. & Young, R. (2021) Mine completion criteria defined by best-practice: A global meta-analysis and Western Australian case studies. *Journal of Environmental Management,* **282,** 111912.

McMurdie, P.J. & Holmes, S. (2013) phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. *PLoS One,* **8,** e61217.

Menz, M.H.M., Dixon, K.W. & Hobbs, R.J. (2013) Hurdles and Opportunities for Landscape-Scale Restoration. *Science,* **339,** 526.

Neumann, R.B. & Cardon, Z.G. (2012) The magnitude of hydraulic redistribution by plant roots: a review and synthesis of empirical and modeling studies. *New Phytologist,* **194,** 337-352.

Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Szoecs, E. & Wagner, H. (2020) vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-7.

Orozco-Aceves, M., Standish, R.J. & Tibbett, M. (2015) Soil conditioning and plant-soil feedbacks in a modified forest ecosystem are soil-context dependent. *Plant and Soil,* **390,** 183-194.

Orozco-Aceves, M., Tibbett, M. & Standish, R.J. (2017) Correlation between soil development and native plant growth in forest restoration after surface mining. *Ecological engineering,* **106,** 209-218.

R-Core-Team (2020) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Rydgren, K., Halvorsen, R., Töpper, J.P., Auestad, I., Hamre, L.N., Jongejans, E. & Sulavik, J. (2019) Advancing restoration ecology: A new approach to predict time to recovery. *Journal of Applied Ecology,* **56,** 225-234.

Schloss, P.D. (2020) Removal of rare amplicon sequence variants from 16S rRNA gene sequence surveys biases the interpretation of community structure data. *bioRxiv*, 2020.2012.2011.422279.

Schmid, C.A.O., Reichel, R., Schröder, P., Brüggemann, N. & Schloter, M. (2020) 52 years of ecological restoration following a major disturbance by opencast lignite mining does not reassemble microbiome structures of the original arable soils. *Science of The Total Environment,* **745,** 140955.

Tibbett, M. (2010) Large-scale mine site restoration of Australian eucalypt forests after bauxite mining: soil management and ecosystem development. *Ecology of Industrial Pollution*, pp. 309-326.

Tibbett, M. (2015) *Mining in Ecologically Sensitive Landscapes*. Victoria: CSIRO Publishing, Victoria.

Turner, T.R., Ramakrishnan, K., Walshaw, J., Heavens, D., Alston, M., Swarbreck, D., Osbourn, A., Grant, A. & Poole, P.S. (2013) Comparative metatranscriptomics reveals kingdom level changes in the rhizosphere microbiome of plants. *The ISME Journal,* **7,** 2248-2258.

van der Heyde, M., Bunce, M., Dixon, K., Wardell-Johnson, G., White, N.E. & Nevill, P. (2020) Changes in soil microbial communities in post mine ecological restoration: Implications for monitoring using high throughput DNA sequencing. *Science of The Total Environment,* **749,** 142262.

Walker, L.R., Wardle, D.A., Bardgett, R.D. & Clarkson, B.D. (2010) The use of chronosequences in studies of ecological succession and soil development. *Journal of Ecology,* **98,** 725-736.