Genomic fingerprints of the world's soil ecosystems

Emily B. Graham[a,b#], Vanessa A. Garayburu-Caruso[a,c], Ruonan Wu[a], Jianqiu Zheng[a], and Gerrad

Jones[d]

[a]Earth and Biological Sciences Directorate, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,

WA, USA

[b]School of Biological Sciences, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

[c]School of the Environment, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

[d]Department of Biological and Ecological Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR,

USA

[#]Address correspondence to Emily B. Graham, emily.graham@pnnl.gov.

Abstract. Despite the explosion of soil metagenomic data, we lack a synthesized understanding

of patterns in the distribution and functions of soil microorganisms. These patterns are critical to

predictions of soil microbiome responses to climate change and resulting feedbacks that regulate

greenhouse gas release from soils. To address this gap, we assayed 1512 manually-curated soil

metagenomes using complementary annotation databases, read-based taxonomy, and machine

learning to extract multidimensional genomic fingerprints of global soil microbiomes. We reveal

novel biogeographical patterns of soil microbiomes across environmental factors and ecological

biomes with high molecular resolution. Specifically, we demonstrate shifts in the potential for

microbial nutrient acquisition across pH gradients; for stress, transport, and redox-based

processes across changes in soil bulk density; and for greenhouse gas emissions across biomes.

We also use an unsupervised approach to reveal a collection of soils with distinct genomic

signatures, characterized by coordinated changes in soil organic carbon, nitrogen, and cation

exchange capacity and in bulk density and clay content that may ultimately reflect soil

environments with high microbial activity. Genomic fingerprints for these soils highlight the

importance of resource scavenging, plant-microbe interactions, fungi, and heterotrophic

metabolisms. Across all analyses, we observed phylogenetic coherence in soil microbiomes —

more closely related microorganisms tended to move congruently in response to soil factors.

Collectively, the genomic fingerprints uncovered here present a basis for global patterns in the

microbial mechanisms underlying soil biogeochemistry and help beget tractable microbial

reaction networks for incorporation into process-based models of soil carbon and nutrient

cycling.

Importance. We address a critical gap in our understanding of soil microorganisms and their

functions, which have a profound impact on our environment. We analyzed 1512 global soils

with advanced analytics to create detailed genetic profiles (fingerprints) of soil microbiomes.

This reveals novel patterns in how these microorganisms are distributed across different soil

environments. For instance, we discovered shifts in their potential to acquire nutrients in relation

to soil acidity, as well as changes in stress responses and potential greenhouse gas emissions

linked to soil density. We also identified soils with putative high activity that had unique

genomic characteristics surrounding resource acquisition, plant-microbe interactions, and fungal

activity. Finally, we observed that closely related microorganisms tend to respond in similar

ways to changes in their surroundings. Our work is a significant step towards comprehending the

intricate world of soil microorganisms and its role in the global climate.

Introduction.

Soil microbiomes catalyze some of the most biogeochemically important reactions on Earth, yet their complexity hampers our efforts to fully understand their function (1–6). Microbial destabilization of soil carbon stores, for instance, has positive feedbacks with the global climate (7–9); and microorganism-driven soil nutrient cycles sustain life at higher trophic levels (10–12). The molecular revolution, including new 'omics sequencing approaches, promises a new generation of fundamental and predictive understanding; imperatives for understanding how soil microbial communities individually and collectively contribute to carbon and nutrient cycling under environmental change. Yet despite the immense amount of soil metagenomic data now available, we lack a synthesized understanding of patterns in the distribution and functions of soil microorganisms that are critical to developing new and improved predictive models (13–18).

While global patterns are well-established for most macroorganisms, the extreme diversity of the soil microbiome and the myriad ecological factors that act upon it complicate efforts to understand patterns in its structure and function (19–27). Microbial assembly processes, dormancy, and above-belowground and interspecies interactions are among many other factors that influence soil microbial biogeography (19, 21, 26, 28–33). Patterns in microbial distributions are almost always weaker than those observed in macroecological systems due to these factors (26, 34, 35). Still, soil microbiome structure and function have been associated with variables such as latitude, vegetation, climate, pH, texture, moisture, carbon, and nutrients at local to global scales (3–5, 18, 19, 28, 34, 36–60).

A clear understanding of soil microbial biogeography is essential to predictions of soil microbiome function under novel climate scenarios. Microbiome composition (i.e., taxonomy

and functional potential) impacts ecosystem processes, such as biogeochemical cycling, through

differences in extracellular enzyme production, carbon use efficiency, symbiotic relationships

with plants, and other factors (14, 44, 61–68). In turn, changes to microbial distribution across

environmental gradients can elucidate how soil functions may shift in relation to environmental

change; particularly if novel ecosystems supplant existing soil environments (26, 69, 70). For

instance, Ladau et al. (71) used current and historical biogeographical patterns of

microorganisms to predict their distributions under future climate scenarios.

New technologies and analytical techniques allow for direct assessment of the genetic

potential of soils to mediate biogeochemistry (4, 18). Yet modern technologies based on genomic

sequencing often generate a tremendous amount of data. The detection of genes that are nearly

ubiquitous (e.g., central metabolisms), poorly annotated, and/or of little relevance to soil

processes in particular can obscure biogeographical patterns in the soil microbiome. Many

researchers have attempted to distill this information into tractable units using trait-based

approaches, keystone species analyses, and/or core microbiome assessments, with mixed results

for deciphering broad patterns in microbial processes (27, 44, 62, 72–74). Other common

challenges to understanding microbial biogeography include the detection of rare organisms and

assigning thresholds for microbial taxonomy, both of which can influence patterns observed in

soil microbiomes (34, 75).

As such, fundamental questions regarding global soil microbial distributions and their

drivers remain largely unanswered (74, 76). Advanced analytics, including machine learning-

based approaches, in combination with global sequencing resources are essential for the next

generation of research in microbial ecology (18, 61, 77, 78). Here, we examine a comprehensive

set of 1512 manually-curated soil metagenomic samples to decipher patterns in soil genomic

potential across commonly measured environmental gradients and ecological biomes. We assay

metagenomic sequences using an array of complementary annotation databases, read-based

taxonomic assignment, and machine learning algorithms to extract multidimensional genomic

fingerprints of global soil microbiomes. We reveal never reported biogeographical patterns in

soil microbiome composition and functional potential that provide a molecular basis for

predicting soil microbial responses to climate change.

Results.

Microbial clades and genomic potential across all soils.

Soil metagenomic sequences spanned most major biomes, continents, and environmental

conditions (Figure 1, Table S1 and Table S2). Bulk density, cation exchange capacity, nitrogen

(N), pH, soil organic carbon, and clay content ranged from 0.28-1.56 cg/cm³, 7.7-68.7

mmol(c)/kg, 0.25-22.4 cg/kg, 4.4-8.3, 2.4-510.9 dg/kg, and 2.7-57.1 g/kg respectively.

The most abundant microbial attributes (i.e., gene annotations by Kyoto Encyclopedia of

Genes and Genomes (KEGG)(79, 80), the Pfam (81) and TIGRFAM protein databases (82), and

read-based taxonomy, see methods) are shown in Figure 2. Multiple annotation databases

provide complementary information and are standard operating procedure by the U.S.

Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute (JGI)(83, 84). Abundant KEGG orthology (KO)

were associated bacterial secretion systems (K12510), redox reactions (K00104, K00334,

K03882, K00380), and cellular growth processes (K02335, K02049, K00334, K03882, K03088).

Abundant Pfam comprised tolerance to common soil stressors including temperature (PF11999,

PF08496) and salinity (PF12838), as well as functions involved in microbial growth (PF08511,

PF07357, PF13247, PF00005). The most abundant TIGRFAM were also associated with soil

stressors; for example, TIGR00229 (PAS Domain S-box protein) is involved in sensing changes

in light, redox potential, oxygen, and other stressors (85). Other highly abundant TIGRFAM

across all soils included a sigma-factor that may be associated with microbial responses to

environmental fluctuation (TIGR02937) and other signaling and sensing processes (TIGR00254,

TIGR00231). Finally, abundant microbial genera include diverse microorganisms including

Burkholderia, Mycobacterium, Streptomyces, Acetobacter, and Pseudonocardia.

Variation in genomic potential across environmental gradients.

After assessing multiple machine learning algorithms, we used random forest regression

to extract microbial attributes associated with soil factors and ecological biomes (see methods).

Soil pH, bulk density, and biome type were the strongest correlates of microbial attributes (i.e,

they generated well-fitting models with comparatively high explanatory power relative to other

factors). The cross-validated random forest model for each of the variables above had a cross-

validated root mean square error (RMSE) of less than 0.8 (often < 0.2) and/or at least 60%

variance explained. Models for cation exchange capacity, nitrogen, soil organic carbon, and clay

content did not meet these thresholds. Results were conceptually consistent across different

microbial attributes. A full description of all genomic fingerprints is in Extended Data File 1.

pH separated soil microbiomes by nutrient and vitamin B-related genes (Figure 3). More

alkaline soils were characterized by vitamin B-, nutrient-, and phosphatase-related activities, for

instance with genomic fingerprints that included K01662, PF01872, K08717, TIGR00378,

PF01966, and PF00481; as well as many genuses of Alphaproteobacteria. More acidic soils were

signified by ammonia- and complex organic polymer- (e.g., wood-) related reactions, with

genomic fingerprints that included K14333, K01684, TIGR03404, and TIGR02093, and

microbial clades using ammonia as a substrate (Rhodopseudomonas and Klebsiella).

Bulk density separated soil microbiomes by factors associated with soil structure,

hydrology, and nutrient content. The genomic fingerprint of low bulk density soils comprised

genes involved in organic N and methane cycling, as well as signatures of anoxia (Figure 3). It

included K00992, K11261, K11959, TIGR03323, TIGR01392, and microorganisms associated

with anoxic and/or aquatic environments (Gardnerella, Cetia, Salmonella, Olleya, Mycoplasma,

Escherichia, Enterobacter, and Chitinophaga). Conversely, high bulk density soils were signified

by genes involved in microbial transport, stress, pigmentation, and infection mechanisms.

Notable attributes associated with high bulk density soils included K00854, K11733, K03799,

TIGR01263, TIGR01957, TIGR01203, PF00582, PF03631, and four Alphaproteobacteria.

Four biomes were highlighted with distinct genomic signatures by our models – flooded

grasslands & savannas, tundras, boreal forest, and montane grasslands/shrublands (Figure 4).

The soil genomic fingerprint of flooded grasslands/savannas were primarily characterized by

positive associations with organic N (K13497, K07395, K19702, K02042), phosphorus (P,

K02042, K00854, K02800, PF04273), stress tolerance (heat and arsenic: TIGR04282,

TIGR02348), motility (PF00669, PF00482, Paeniclostridium). The genomic fingerprint for

tundras had the greatest number positive gene associations, including those with methanogenesis

(K11261, TIGR03323, TIGR03321, TIGR03322, TIGR03306, TIGR01392, TIGR02145), nitric

oxide (PF08768), P transfer (K03525, K00997, K00992, K13497, PF08009), and pathogenesis

(PF11203, PF05045); supported by the presence of anaerobic (Gardnerella, Escherichia,

Kosakonia, Glaesserella, Mycoplasma, Treponema, Paeniclostridium) and possible plant-growth

promoting genuses (Kosakonia).

Boreal forest and montane grasslands/shrublands had fingerprints that primarily consisted

of negative associations. In boreal forests, this consisted of negative relationships with

magnesium (Mg, K03284) and P- (K06217) related genes and carbohydrate and organic N

metabolism (K02800, K11472, PF00208, PF04685); as well as some metal-related genes

(TIGR00378, TIGR04282, TIGR00003). Additionally, they were negatively associated with

anaerobic genera (Treponema, Enteractinococcus). Montane systems also were negatively

characterized by genes related to Mg and P (K01520, K04765, TIGR01203), carbohydrate

metabolism (K01816), virulence (PF09299), and motility (PF00669), as well as organic N

(K07395, K00600, PF00208) and S (K03644). They were also negatively associated with

anaerobic genera (Gardnerella, Thielavia, Coniochaeta, Escherichia, Salmonella, Kosakonia,

Shigella, Mycoplasma, Treponema, Glaesserella, Enteractinococcus, Paeniclostridium) .

Interestingly in all analyses across pH, bulk density, and biomes, we observed

phylogenetic coherence in soil microbiomes — the normalized abundances of more closely

related microorganisms tended to move congruently in response to biome type and

environmental factors (Figure 4B, Extended Data File 1).

Unsupervised machine learning to disentangle environmental interactions associated with soil

genomic potential.

Finally, we used an unsupervised approach to reveal a collection of soils with distinct

genomic fingerprints that were characterized by coordinated changes in soil organic carbon

content, total N, and cation exchange capacity and in bulk density and clay content (Figure 5,

Extended Data 2). We identified KO cluster 7, genus cluster 6, and Pfam cluster 1 as containing

soil samples that exhibited the strongest coordinated changes (defined by number of significant

correlations and R2 values, see methods). TIGRFAMs did not exhibit these patterns.

Selected microbial KO and genera were positively correlated with SOC, N, and CEC and

negatively associated with bulk density and clay; while Pfam cluster 1 exhibited opposite

patterns. Samples in KO cluster 7 and genus cluster 6 had high relative abundances of genes

associated with energy generation (K00334. K00339, K00324, K08738), filamentous

bacteria/biofilms (K11903, Nocardia, Streptomyces, Mycobacterium, Leptolyngbya), chemically

complex organic matter decomposers (Nocardia, Rhodococcus, Streptomyces) and N-fixers and

plant symbionts (Rhizobium, Bradyrhizobium, Nostoc), while genes associated with N-related

processes (K07685, K10041) and microbial interactions including signaling and secretion

(K12537, K02661) changed most dramatically across environmental gradients. A diverse set of

organisms were amongst the most variable clades across environmental gradients, including N

cyclers (Uliginosibacterium, Microvirgula), autotrophs/anaerobes (Methanosalsum, Salana,

Pseudobacteroides, Sulfurirhabdus, Microvirgula, Desulfallas, Pelotomaculum, Risungbinella),

and one plant genus (Zea) and plant-related microbes (Pseudobacteroides, Zeaxanthinibacter,

Parapedobacter). Samples in Pfam cluster 1 had high relative abundances of organic N-

(PF01979, PF08352, PF01842), P- (PF00406, PF01380), and signaling-related (PF01627,

PF09413) genes, while many genes thought to be associated with eukaryotes changed most

dramatically across environmental gradients (PF04178, PF03188, PF01793).

Discussion.

Abundant microbial genera, functional genes, and environmental correlates across all soils.

The most abundant microbial genera spanned diverse microbial lineages and known

functions, highlighting high soil diversity relative to other environments (5, 18, 45, 46). This

included members of commonly observed soil taxa including Alphaproteobacteria,

Betaproteobacteria, and Actinobacteria (45). Widespread genomic functions included growth,

resource acquisition and stress tolerance strategies essential for microbial persistence in

heterogeneous soil environments. For instance, bacterial secretion systems were common as well

as DNA repair/replication, transport, and energy generation functions. Interestingly, microbial

genes for the sensing and/or tolerance of fluctuations in temperature, salinity, light, and redox

conditions were encoded among the most abundant microbial genes across all soils; all of which

are common soil microbial stressors (86, 87). Collectively, this distribution underscores the

heterogeneous mixture of stressors in the soil microbiome. The high global soil microbial

diversity observed here can obscure patterns in microbiome structure and function, indicating the

use of machine learning-based tools to unravel its complexity (18, 45, 88).

Soil genomic potential corresponds to pH, bulk density, and biome type.

Soil genomic patterns were evident across soil pH, bulk density, and biomes; however,

hypothesized drivers of the soil microbiome including soil organic carbon, total N, and cation

exchange capacity were not associated with distinct genomic fingerprints. Soil carbon, N, and

cation exchange capacity can reflect resource availability and are often drivers of soil

microbiome change at local scales (14, 36, 89–91). The lack of trends at the global scales may

represent heterogeneity in the importance of resources in structuring microbiomes; indeed, the

influence of deterministic (e.g., selection) versus stochastic (e.g., random) assembly processes on

soil microbiomes varies through space and time (30, 92–95). While our results support pH as a

primary determinant of soil microbial structure and function (5, 6, 28, 45), it is interesting that

bulk density was also a strong correlate of genomic patterns. This may reflect the importance of

biophysical and hydraulic properties on soil microbiome structure and function (92, 96–98).

The genomic fingerprint of alkaline soils may be important for understanding

belowground microbial dynamics in arid and semiarid ecosystems, which account for more than

35% of the global land surface (99). The soil matrix in these systems is porous, with low rates of

water retention, and contains an abundance of calcium carbonate that limits P bioavailability

(100). Accordingly, its genomic fingerprint was enriched in genes encoding phosphatases and

related functions (PF01966, PF00481) that may signify the importance of microbial P acquisition

and/or limitation in alkaline soils (101–104). Vitamin B-related genes were also included in this

fingerprint and have also been linked to P solubilization (K01662, PF01872)(105). The presence

of a urea transporter (K08717) may likewise indicate the importance of nutrient acquisition in

alkaline soils (106). Notably, the high-Ca2+ alkaline soil environment was also characterized by

a calcium/proton exchanger (TIGR00378) which regulates intracellular Ca2+ concentrations to

prevent Ca2+ overload (107) and an uncharacterized hydrophobic domain (TIGR00271) that

may arise from low moisture environments that are often associated with alkaline soils.

In contrast, more acidic soils were characterized by genes encoding reactions involving

ammonia as well as wood decomposition, both of which can produce H+ as a byproduct. For

instance, nitrification is a hallmark of microbial genera Rhodopseudomonas and Klebsiella (108–

110) and increases soil acidity through the release of H+ from ammonia. Likewise, wood-

degrading fungi often secrete acidic compounds to aid in the digestion of chemically-complex

polymers (111–114). This is consistent with the association of K14333, K01684, TIGR03404,

and TIGR02093 with low pH soils.

255   Various members of Alphaproteobacteria were included in the genomic fingerprints of

256 both high and low pH soils. Alphaproteobacteria has been previously shown to be sensitive to

257 variation in soil pH, and some members may also be associated with vitamin B-related processes

258 indicative of alkaline soils (115, 116). These results suggest Alphaproteobacteria as a sensitive

259 taxa to global environmental changes in soil pH (e.g., atmospheric nitrogen deposition).

260   Additionally, bulk density can influence soil microbiomes by reflecting biophysical soil

261 properties such as texture, water content, porosity, and mineralogy that drive community

262 structure and function (19, 53, 54, 117, 118). Patterns in the relationships between these

263 variables and the soil microbiome can be complex at global scales (19), and our findings are to

264 our knowledge, the first to report a global-scale relationship between bulk density and the

265 distribution of genes encoded by the soil microbiome.

266   Genomic signatures of low bulk density soils were characterized by genes common to

267 water-logged and/or agricultural soils, while high bulk density soils included potential functions

268 associated with transport mechanisms, stress tolerance, and virulence. For instance, K11261,

269 TIGR03323, and TIGR01392 – all signatures of low bulk density soil – are each associated with

270 methanogenic processes (119). Low bulk density soils were further characterized by a suite of

271 anaerobic and/or aquatic microorganisms including Gardnerella, Cetia, Salmonella, Olleya,

272 Mycoplasma, Escherichia, Enterobacter, and Chitinophaga that also supports microbial

273 persistence in water-saturated environments (120–128). The presence of potential functions

274 associated with organic N cycling in the low bulk density fingerprint (K00992, K11959)

275 additionally suggests the influence of agriculture on microorganisms, where tillage generates

276 loosely packed soils and fertilizer application enhances nutrient cycles. In contrast, the genomic

277 fingerprint of high bulk density soils suggest an environment inclusive of density-dependent

relationships between microorganisms, their substrates, and pathogens (transport: K00854,

K11733, TIGR01957, TIGR01203; virulence: PF03631, TIGR01203). Stress-related genes

(K03799, PF00582.24) may be reflective of this competitive environment; or related to

ecosystem processes such as soil compaction which is common in deserts and can elevate soil

temperatures through the exclusion of vegetation (K03799).

Finally, soil habitat (reflected here by biome type) seemed to be a driver of dissimilarity

in microbiome structure and potential function, providing detailed information on the molecular

biology of global soil ecosystems. We highlight the genomic fingerprint associated with tundra

ecosystems in particular, as tundras are experiencing rapid changes in response to global climate

drivers (129, 130). Tundras displayed the highest number of taxa and potential functions in their

genomic fingerprint, the vast majority of which were positively associated with the tundra

biome. This provides evidence for a consistent and distributed genomic basis for enhanced

greenhouse gas emissions associated with permafrost thaw in tundra (129, 131, 132).

Methanogenesis in particular is responsible for fluxes of methane in warming tundra. A gene

involved in nitric oxide cycling (PF08768) (133–135), as well as a variety of anaerobic

organisms and P-related genes (K03525, K00997, K00992, K13497, PF08009) (136–138), also

provide insight into the molecular functions of tundra in the context of global climate change.

Interestingly, we also found evidence for pathogen resistance within the tundra genomic

signature (PF11203, PF05045), lending credence to a small number of recent studies suggesting

permafrost environments as one of the largest reservoirs of soil viruses (139–142) and a possible

linkage between soil methane and viral infection (143).

Flooded grasslands/savannas also generally had positive associations with functions in

their genomic fingerprint, many of which encoded nutrient cycling, stress tolerance, or motility.

Motility (PF00669, PF00482, Paeniclostridium) may be reflective of beneficial microbial

lifestyles in saturated systems, where movement is facilitated by high pore space connectivity.

Genomic processes reflecting organic N (K13497, K07395, K19702, K02042), P (K02042,

K00854, K02800, PF04273), and stress tolerance (TIGR04282, TIGR02348) may reflect

microbial adaptations to nutrient scarcity and other stressors. Interestingly, a mechanism for

arsenic resistance was reflected in the flooded grasslands/savannas genomic fingerprint, possibly

reflecting arsenic groundwater contamination in many regions of the world (144).

In contrast, boreal forest and montane grasslands/shrublands were signified by many

negative associations with Mg and P (boreal: K03284, K06217, montane: K01520, K04765,

TIGR01203), and organic N and carbohydrate-related genes (boreal: K02800, K11472, PF00208,

PF04685; montane: K01816, K07395, K00600, PF00208); as well as many anaerobic microbial

genera – though the specific microbial attributes differed amongst these two fingerprints. The

boreal forest fingerprint uniquely included some metal-related genes (TIGR00378, TIGR04282,

TIGR00003); while montane systems were uniquely characterized by virulence (PF09299),

motility (PF00669), and sulfur-related genes (K03644). The negative associations with carbon,

N, and P suggest that inorganic nutrients and carbon may be more available in these systems

relative to other systems. Mg is often associated with plant growth (145) – taken together, these

biomes may be slower growing and have fewer resource constraints overall than other

ecosystems.

Collectively, we reveal novel biogeographical patterns in specific aspects of soil

microbiome composition and potential function that have not been reported elsewhere. Our

results are consistent with ecological processes hypothesized to influence the soil microbiome

and provide greater molecular specificity than revealed by previous works. They enable us to

better understand microbial lifestyles that support the persistence of certain members over others;

such knowledge underlies a predictive understanding of soil microbiome changes with shifts in

the global climate. Additionally, relationships between biomes and specific microbial attributes,

beyond associations with individual variables, suggest that there may be multiple simultaneous

factors that structure soil microbiome composition and function. Because of this, we next

explored relationships between microbial attributes and soil factors that arose naturally out of

unsupervised analysis. This allowed us to infer interactive effects that could not be assessed

when specifying a single environmental gradient.

Environmental interactions correspond to variability in soil genomic potential.

Unsupervised machine learning uncovered soil microbial genomic attributes associated

with coordinated associations with soil organic carbon content, total N, and cation exchange

capacity and oppositely with clay content and bulk density (Figure 5); which may represent some

of the most biologically-active soils on Earth. Soils rich in organic carbon and N with high cation

exchange capacity constitute resource- and energy-rich environments, supported by an

abundance of energy generating genes in the fingerprint of these soils (K00334, K00339,

K00324, K08738). Interestingly, these environments are best explained by a combination of

environmental variables rather than an individual factor. As an example, soils with high soil

organic carbon alone could be limited by N or other nutrients; thus, we propose that genomic

fingerprints for multiple simultaneously interacting factors may be among the most critical for

understanding global biogeochemistry. They are nearly impossible to discern without

unsupervised statistical approaches, and we know of no other work that has done so.

Soils with high organic carbon, N, and cation exchange capacity were characterized by

genes associated with resource scavenging, plant-microbe interactions, and heterotrophic

metabolisms. We observed numerous attributes in their genomic fingerprint associated with

filments or biofilms, intra-organism signalling. and/or chemically-complex organic matter

decomposition (K11903, K12537, K02661, Nocardia, Streptomyces, Mycobacterium,

Leptolyngbya, Nocardia, Rhodococcus, Streptomyces). This is consistent with microbial

morphologies and lifestyles that support the decay of chemically recalcitrant polymers (e.g.,

wood), as well as nutrient acquisition and transport across soil pore networks. Plant-microbe

interactions, including symbiotic N-fixing organisms, were also a key feature of these soils,

highlighting the importance of above- and belowground connectivity in productivity

(Rhizobium, Bradyrhizobium, Nostoc, Pseudobacteroides, Zeaxanthinibacter, Parapedobacter,

Zea)(146). In contrast, anaerobic and autotrophic organisms were highly sensitive to changes

across these connected environmental gradients, possibly reflecting their exclusion from more

oxygen- and energy-rich environments where heterotrophic organisms tend to dominate.

We also selected one Pfam cluster that was associated with low soil organic carbon, N,

and cation exchange capacity and with high clay and bulk density soils, which seemed to

underscore the importance of fungi in resource- and energy-rich environments. The most

sensitive genes in this cluster of samples corresponded to eukaryotic organisms (PF04178,

PF03188, PF01793). Previous work has shown fungal sensitivity to soil resource availability, as

well as high fungal diversity in organic-rich tropical soils (52). Overall, these insights provide

greater resolution into the microbial mechanisms that support both belowground biogeochemical

cycles and aboveground productivity than ever before, and they can provide a basis for the next

generation of microbial ecology research and model development.

Phylogenetic Coherence in Microbial Biogeography.

To what extent selection acts on phylogenetically conserved properties versus functional

attributes and to what extent that translates into functional differences in the microbiome (e.g.,

response-effect traits (147)) are long running questions in microbial ecology . Some previous

works have shown little connection between functional attributes and microbial phylogeny (44,

148), while others have indicated the existence of taxa-function relationships (88). And still

others have suggested variation in the coupling of taxonomy and function across various

functions of interest, levels of phylogenetic resolution, and/or spatial scales (34, 55, 61, 149,

150). We found strong phylogenetic coherence in the response of genera to changes in the soil

environment (Figure 4B); that is, closely related organisms tended to respond similarly to

environmental change. This implies that evolutionary history, life history strategies, and/or

morphology (which tend to be phylogenetically conserved (151)) could influence changes in

microbial community membership in response to environmental change. As such, metabarcoding

approaches that yield microbiome taxonomy may be among the first indicators of ecosystem

transitions, such as response to disturbances and transitions between state archetypes (30).

Conclusions.

Despite the significance of soil microorganisms in global biogeochemistry, we still know

little about the ecological processes that regulate their composition and function across the wide

range of global soil environments. We used machine learning to sift through tens of thousands of

taxa and potential functions encoded by 1512 global soil microbiomes, revealing novel

biogeographical patterns in soil microbiome composition and functional potential with high

molecular resolution. Specifically, we demonstrate shifts in the potential for microbial nutrient

acquisition across pH gradients; in stress, transport, and redox-based processes across changes in

soil bulk density; and in genes and organisms associated with soil greenhouse gas emissions

across biomes. We also uncover a suite of metabolic processes that are enriched in the microbial

genomes of energy-rich soils. These changes were coincident with phylogenetically congruent

compositional change – suggesting that closely related soil microbial taxa are sensitive to similar

environmental stressors. Our work enables us to better understand microbial lifestyles that

support the persistence of certain members over others along environmental gradients; such

knowledge underlies a predictive understanding of soil microbiome changes with shifts in the

global climate and is vital to constraining biochemical reactions that regulate the release of

greenhouse gasses from soils.

Materials and Methods.

Dataset Description and Normalization.

We collected 1512 manually-curated soil metagenomic samples available in the Joint

Genome Institute's (JGI) Integrated Microbial Genomes and Microbiomes (IMG/M) platform in

August 2020 as described by Graham et al. 2023 (in review), of which 1493 were associated with

latitudinal and longitudinal information. Samples span most major biomes and continents (Figure

1; Table S1 and Table S2). Sequences were quality controlled, assembled, and annotated by

KEGG Orthology (KO), the Pfam and TIGRFAM protein family databases, and read-based

taxonomy by the JGI's standard workflows (80–84). Due to the collective size of assembled

sequences, we focused on annotations and read-based taxonomy for downstream analysis, which

is more computationally feasible than sequence assemblies or metagenome-assembled genomes

that are impractical at the scale of thousands of samples.

Each dataset (i.e., KO, Pfam, TIGRFAM, and read-based taxonomy) was independently

normalized by the following procedure prior to analysis. For Pfam and KO annotations only,

samples with greater than 2000 total reads were retained. For TIGRFAM annotations only,

samples with greater than 500 total reads were retained. A lower cutoff was used for TIGRFAM

data as the total read counts were lower in this dataset. For all three annotations, only functions

with a non-zero value in at least half of the samples or a total count of 7560 (corresponding to an

average of 5 reads per sample for each function) were retained. For species, we retained only

samples with greater than 4000 counts and species with a non-zero value in at least half of the

samples or a total count of 7560 (corresponding to an average of 5 reads per sample for each

species). After removing low abundant samples and functions/species, all four datasets were then

normalized using the trimmed mean of M values (TMM) method (152). We found that this

method gave us the best results when examining normalized data using a box and whisker plot

(data not shown).

We assigned biome type and soil properties to each sample using publicly available

resources. We used latitude and longitude to derive using Olson biomes (153) for each sample

using data provided by the World Wildlife Federation (154). Soil parameters were collected from

the SoilGrids250m database from 0-5 cm (155). SoilGrids250m is a spatial interpolation of

global soil parameters using ~150,000 soil samples and 158 remote sensing-based products.

Here, we focus on six parameters often associated with soil microbiomes: bulk density, cation

exchange capacity, nitrogen, pH, soil organic C, and clay content. Because our focus on spatial

dynamics and soils were collected at various times, we did not include temporally dynamic

variables such as soil moisture or temperature in our set of environmental parameters, though we

acknowledge they may have profound impacts on the soil microbiome.

Machine Learning for Genomic Fingerprints.

We selected random forests as our primary statistical approach by assessing the ability of

various machine learning algorithms to adequately parse soil microbial attributes across

environmental variables and ecological biomes. Models were built and validated using 10-fold

cross validation repeated five times, 50% of the data for training, and 50% of the data for testing.

Models from different algorithms were compared using cross validation (CV) scores and

variance explained (data not shown). Random forest models consistently yielded comparatively

high CV scores and proportion of variance explained.

Thus, we constructed random forest models to extract genomic fingerprints from soil

microbiomes using two approaches (1) a supervised split across variables known to be associated

with soil microbiomes and (2) an unsupervised approach that allowed predictors and their

interactions to naturally arise. Random forest models were built in R Software (156) for each

attribute type independently using the 'caret' package (157).

In (1), we divided samples into either two groups containing the highest and lowest 10%

of values for each environmental factor or one group per biome. We then used random forests to

rank each microbial attribute according to their importance (i.e., difference in mean square error

normalized by standard error, varImp function in 'caret' package) to differentiate samples across

each environmental factor or biome. Subsequently, because variable importances followed an

exponential decay, we used breakpoint analysis to define a set of the most important variables

distinguishing each group ('strucchange' package, $h = 0.01$ with a minimum segment size of

two) (158). Because this resulted in one set of attributes that drove variation in soil microbiomes

in relation to a given environmental factor or biome, we extracted attributes associated with high

(positive slope) or low (negative slope) values of each environmental factor using linear

regression. The resultant attributes comprised two genomic fingerprints per environmental factor

or biome—one associated with low values and one associated with high values.

In (2), we first used k-means clustering to group samples with similar microbial attributes

using R packages: 'vegan' (159), 'mgcv' (160), and 'cluster' (161). The optimal number of

clusters was chosen by evaluating the total sum of squares and the silhouette index (162). To

determine the extent to which soil microbiomes within each cluster corresponded to changes in

environmental factors, we related the total normalized abundance of attributes per sample to each

environmental factor using linear regression. We then selected one cluster per attribute type for

deeper investigation, chosen by the number of significant correlations with environmental

factors. To generate a genomic fingerprint for the selected cluster, we extracted attributes that

were either most abundant or most variable within the cluster. As in approach (1), we used

breakpoint analysis to define a set of the most abundant attributes per cluster ('strucchange'

package, h = 0.01 with a minimum segment size of two). To determine the most variable

attributes per cluster, we calculated the coefficient of variation for each attribute and then used

breakpoint analysis to extract the most variable attributes.

We used the following packages for data manipulation and visualization: 'ggplot2' (163),

'dplyr' (164), 'factoextra' (165), 'Hmisc' (166), 'colorspace' (167), 'RColorBrewer' (168),

'gridExtra' (169), 'tidyverse' (170), and 'maps' (171). Additionally, for visualizations of read-

based taxonomy, we generated phylogenetic trees using phyloT v2 (172), an online tree

generator based on the Genome Taxonomy Database. Then, we visualized the tree in R using the

packages 'ggtree'(173), 'treeio'(174), and 'ggnewscale'(175). We generated heatmaps using the

'pheatmap' package (176).

Acknowledgements.

This work was performed under a Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) from

the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). PNNL is operated by Battelle Memorial

Institute for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-76RL01830. We

thank the U.S. Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute (JGI) for maintaining the public

Integrated Microbial Genomes and Microbiomes (IMG/M) platform from which we obtained this

dataset.

Data availability.

496   All data are publicly available via the JGI IMG/MG platform.

497   **Figures.**

500   **Figure 1. Dataset description. (**A) Map of samples, (B) total assembled bp, and (C) number of

501   samples; all colored by biome according to Olson et al. (153). (D-I) distribution of environmental

502   variables from SoilGrids250m (155).

Figure 2. Most abundant genomic attributes across all soils. Relative abundance of the top 15

most abundant soil microbial genomic attributes annotated by (A) KEGG orthology, protein

family (B, Pfam, C, TIGRFAM), and (D) read-based taxonomy collated at the genus-level.

Figure 3. Genomic fingerprints of high- and low-pH and -bulk density soil environments.

Genomic attributes selected in at least one fingerprint for pH or bulk density are visualized.

Pearson correlation coefficient is shown from blue to red in the primary heatmap, with bulk

density correlations on the left and pH correlations on the right. The sidebars (respectively, from

left to right) represent variable importance from random forest models of pH and bulk density

and the type of attribute (e.g., KO, Pfam, TIGRFAM). Please refer to Extended Data 1 for more

information on the specific attributes associated with each soil environment. Read-based

taxonomy collated at the genus-level for each fingerprint is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Genomic fingerprints of soil biomes and phylogenetic distributions of selected soil

microbiomes. (A) The normalized abundance of microbial attributes selected in at least one

biome fingerprint is shown from blue to red. Variable importance is shown in the left side bar

and attribute type is shown in the right side bar. Please refer to Extended Data 1 for more

information on the specific attributes associated with each soil environment. (B) Microbial

genuses selected in at least one fingerprint are depicted on a phylogenetic tree (generated by

PhyloT). The innermost circle shows Pearson correlations with bulk density from green to purple

and variable importance from green to orange. The middle circle shows Pearson correlations

with pH from green to purple and variable importance from green to orange. The outer circle

shows the normalized abundance of genera across biomes (from outer to inner: Temperate

Broadleaf & Mixed Forests; Tundra; Mediterranean Forests, Woodlands & Scrub; Tropical &

Subtropical Grasslands, Savannas & Shrublands; Temperate Grasslands, Savannas &

Shrublands; Boreal Forests/Taigas; Deserts & Xeric Shrublands; Temperate Conifer Forests;

Tropical & Subtropical Dry Broadleaf Forests; Flooded Grasslands & Savannas; Tropical &

Subtropical Moist Broadleaf Forests; and Montane Grasslands & Shrublands). Variable

importance is shown in the outermost ring from green to orange.

Figure 5. Unsupervised clusters of microbial attributes associated with multiple soil factors.

Column (A) KEGG Orthology, (B) microbial genus, and (C) Pfam. TIGRFAM annotations did

not yield a satisfactory model. Rows represent environmental variables. The total normalized

abundance of an attribute per sample is plotted against each environmental variable. Lines and

statistics represent linear regression.

References

1.   Falkowski PG, Fenchel T, Delong EF. 2008. The microbial engines that drive Earth's biogeochemical cycles. Science 320:1034–1039.

2.   Wagg C, Bender SF, Widmer F, van der Heijden MGA. 2014. Soil biodiversity and soil community composition determine ecosystem multifunctionality. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 111:5266–5270.

3.   Delgado-Baquerizo M, Maestre FT, Reich PB, Jeffries TC, Gaitan JJ, Encinar D, Berdugo M, Campbell CD, Singh BK. 2016. Microbial diversity drives multifunctionality in terrestrial ecosystems. Nat Commun 7:10541.

4.   Fierer N. 2017. Embracing the unknown: disentangling the complexities of the soil microbiome. Nat Rev Microbiol 15:579–590.

5.   Fierer N, Strickland MS, Liptzin D, Bradford MA, Cleveland CC. 2009. Global patterns in belowground communities. Ecol Lett 12:1238–1249.

6.   He L, Mazza Rodrigues JL, Soudzilovskaia NA, Barceló M, Olsson PA, Song C, Tedersoo L, Yuan F, Yuan F, Lipson DA, Xu X. 2020. Global biogeography of fungal and bacterial biomass carbon in topsoil. Soil Biol Biochem 151:108024.

7.   Melillo JM, Frey SD, DeAngelis KM, Werner WJ, Bernard MJ, Bowles FP, Pold G, Knorr MA, Grandy AS. 2017. Long-term pattern and magnitude of soil carbon feedback to the climate system in a warming world. Science 358:101–105.

8.   Bradford MA, Wieder WR, Bonan GB, Fierer N, Raymond PA, Crowther TW. 2016. Managing uncertainty in soil carbon feedbacks to climate change. Nat Clim Chang 6:751–758.

9.   Davidson EA, Janssens IA. 2006. Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon decomposition
and feedbacks to climate change. Nature 440:165–173.

10.   Galloway JN, Townsend AR, Erisman JW, Bekunda M, Cai Z, Freney JR, Martinelli
LA, Seitzinger SP, Sutton MA. 2008. Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent
trends, questions, and potential solutions. Science 320:889–892.

11.   Erisman JW, Galloway JN, Seitzinger S, Bleeker A, Dise NB, Petrescu AMR, Leach
AM, de Vries W. 2013. Consequences of human modification of the global nitrogen
cycle. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 368:20130116.

12.   Sparling GP. 1997. Soil microbial biomass, activity and nutrient cycling as indicators of
soil health. Biological indicators of soil health.

13.   Wieder WR, Bonan GB, Allison SD. 2013. Global soil carbon projections are improved
by modelling microbial processes. Nat Clim Chang 3:909–912.

14.   Graham EB, Hofmockel KS. 2022. Ecological stoichiometry as a foundation for omics-
enabled biogeochemical models of soil organic matter decomposition. Biogeochemistry
157:31–50.

15.   Fan X, Gao D, Zhao C, Wang C, Qu Y, Zhang J, Bai E. 2021. Improved model
simulation of soil carbon cycling by representing the microbially derived organic carbon
pool. ISME J 15:2248–2263.

16.   Wang G, Mayes MA, Gu L, Schadt CW. 2014. Representation of dormant and active
microbial dynamics for ecosystem modeling. PLoS ONE 9:e89252.

17.   Qin S, Chen L, Fang K, Zhang Q, Wang J, Liu F, Yu J, Yang Y. 2019. Temperature
sensitivity of SOM decomposition governed by aggregate protection and microbial

586  communities. Sci Adv 5:eaau1218.

587 18. Thompson LR, Sanders JG, McDonald D, Amir A, Ladau J, Locey KJ, Prill RJ, Tripathi

588  A, Gibbons SM, Ackermann G, Navas-Molina JA, Janssen S, Kopylova E, Vázquez-

589  Baeza Y, González A, Morton JT, Mirarab S, Zech Xu Z, Jiang L, Haroon MF, Earth

590  Microbiome Project Consortium. 2017. A communal catalogue reveals Earth's

591  multiscale microbial diversity. Nature 551:457–463.

592 19. Xu X, Wang N, Lipson D, Sinsabaugh R, Schimel J, He L, Soudzilovskaia NA,

593  Tedersoo L. 2020. Microbial macroecology: In search of mechanisms governing

594  microbial biogeographic patterns. Global Ecol Biogeogr

595  https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13162.

596 20. Levin SA. 1992. The Problem of Pattern and Scale in Ecology: The Robert H.

597  MacArthur Award Lecture. Ecology 73:1943–1967.

598 21. Dickey JR, Swenie RA, Turner SC, Winfrey CC, Yaffar D, Padukone A, Beals KK,

599  Sheldon KS, Kivlin SN. 2021. The utility of macroecological rules for microbial

600  biogeography. Front Ecol Evol 9.

601 22. Brown JH, Gillooly JF, Allen AP, Savage VM, West GB. 2004. Toward a metabolic

602  theory of ecology. Ecology 85:1771–1789.

603 23. Wright DH. 1983. Species-Energy Theory: An Extension of Species-Area Theory. Oikos

604  41:496.

605 24. Blackburn TM, Gaston KJ, Loder N. 1999. Geographic gradients in body size: a

606  clarification of Bergmann's rule. Diversity and distributions.

607 25. Stevens GC. 1989. The Latitudinal Gradient in Geographical Range: How so Many

608   Species Coexist in the Tropics. Am Nat 133:240–256.

609   26.   Meyer KM, Memiaghe H, Korte L, Kenfack D, Alonso A, Bohannan BJM. 2018. Why

610   do microbes exhibit weak biogeographic patterns? ISME J 12:1404–1413.

611   27.   Chu H, Gao G-F, Ma Y, Fan K, Delgado-Baquerizo M. 2020. Soil microbial

612   biogeography in a changing world: recent advances and future perspectives. mSystems

613   5.

614   28.   Bahram M, Hildebrand F, Forslund SK, Anderson JL, Soudzilovskaia NA, Bodegom

615   PM, Bengtsson-Palme J, Anslan S, Coelho LP, Harend H, Huerta-Cepas J, Medema

616   MH, Maltz MR, Mundra S, Olsson PA, Pent M, Põlme S, Sunagawa S, Ryberg M,

617   Tedersoo L, Bork P. 2018. Structure and function of the global topsoil microbiome.

618   Nature 560:233–237.

619   29.   Nemergut DR, Schmidt SK, Fukami T, O'Neill SP, Bilinski TM, Stanish LF, Knelman

620   JE, Darcy JL, Lynch RC, Wickey P, Ferrenberg S. 2013. Patterns and processes of

621   microbial community assembly. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 77:342–356.

622   30.   Graham EB, Knelman JE. 2023. Implications of soil microbial community assembly for

623   ecosystem restoration: patterns, process, and potential. Microb Ecol 85:809–819.

624   31.   Finlay BJ. 2002. Global dispersal of free-living microbial eukaryote species. Science

625   296:1061–1063.

626   32.   Greening C, Grinter R, Chiri E. 2019. Uncovering the Metabolic Strategies of the

627   Dormant Microbial Majority: towards Integrative Approaches. mSystems 4.

628   33.   Lennon JT, Jones SE. 2011. Microbial seed banks: the ecological and evolutionary

629   implications of dormancy. Nat Rev Microbiol 9:119–130.

630   34.   Horner-Devine MC, Lage M, Hughes JB, Bohannan BJM. 2004. A taxa-area

631   relationship for bacteria. Nature 432:750–753.

632   35.   Martiny JBH, Bohannan BJM, Brown JH, Colwell RK, Fuhrman JA, Green JL, Horner-

633   Devine MC, Kane M, Krumins JA, Kuske CR, Morin PJ, Naeem S, Ovreås L,

634   Reysenbach A-L, Smith VH, Staley JT. 2006. Microbial biogeography: putting

635   microorganisms on the map. Nat Rev Microbiol 4:102–112.

636   36.   Xu X, Thornton PE, Post WM. 2013. A global analysis of soil microbial biomass

637   carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus in terrestrial ecosystems. Global Ecology and

638   Biogeography 22:737–749.

639   37.   Serna-Chavez HM, Fierer N, van Bodegom PM. 2013. Global drivers and patterns of

640   microbial abundance in soil. Global Ecology and Biogeography 22:1162–1172.

641   38.   Locey KJ, Lennon JT. 2016. Scaling laws predict global microbial diversity. Proc Natl

642   Acad Sci USA 113:5970–5975.

643   39.   Geyer KM, Kyker-Snowman E, Grandy AS, Frey SD. 2016. Microbial carbon use

644   efficiency: accounting for population, community, and ecosystem-scale controls over the

645   fate of metabolized organic matter. Biogeochemistry 127:173–188.

646   40.   Rousk J, Bååth E, Brookes PC, Lauber CL, Lozupone C, Caporaso JG, Knight R, Fierer

647   N. 2010. Soil bacterial and fungal communities across a pH gradient in an arable soil.

648   ISME J 4:1340–1351.

649   41.   Larkin AA, Martiny AC. 2017. Microdiversity shapes the traits, niche space, and

650   biogeography of microbial taxa. Environ Microbiol Rep 9:55–70.

42.   Dequiedt S, Thioulouse J, Jolivet C, Saby NPA, Lelievre M, Maron P-A, Martin MP,

Prévost-Bouré NC, Toutain B, Arrouays D, Lemanceau P, Ranjard L. 2009.

Biogeographical patterns of soil bacterial communities. Environ Microbiol Rep 1:251–

255.

43.   Fuhrman JA, Steele JA, Hewson I, Schwalbach MS, Brown MV, Green JL, Brown JH.

2008. A latitudinal diversity gradient in planktonic marine bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci

USA 105:7774–7778.

44.   Nelson MB, Martiny AC, Martiny JBH. 2016. Global biogeography of microbial

nitrogen-cycling traits in soil. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 113:8033–8040.

45.   Delgado-Baquerizo M, Oliverio AM, Brewer TE, Benavent-González A, Eldridge DJ,

Bardgett RD, Maestre FT, Singh BK, Fierer N. 2018. A global atlas of the dominant

bacteria found in soil. Science 359:320–325.

46.   Fierer N, Jackson RB. 2006. The diversity and biogeography of soil bacterial

communities. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 103:626–631.

47.   Bell T, Ager D, Song J-I, Newman JA, Thompson IP, Lilley AK, van der Gast CJ. 2005.

Larger islands house more bacterial taxa. Science 308:1884.

48.   Zhou J, Kang S, Schadt CW, Garten CT. 2008. Spatial scaling of functional gene

diversity across various microbial taxa. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 105:7768–7773.

49.   Ranjard L, Dequiedt S, Chemidlin Prévost-Bouré N, Thioulouse J, Saby NPA, Lelievre

M, Maron PA, Morin FER, Bispo A, Jolivet C, Arrouays D, Lemanceau P. 2013.

Turnover of soil bacterial diversity driven by wide-scale environmental heterogeneity.

Nat Commun 4:1434.

50.   Wang X-B, Lü X-T, Yao J, Wang Z-W, Deng Y, Cheng W-X, Zhou J-Z, Han X-G.

674   2017. Habitat-specific patterns and drivers of bacterial β-diversity in China's drylands.

675   ISME J 11:1345–1358.

676   51.   Bell T. 2010. Experimental tests of the bacterial distance-decay relationship. ISME J

677   4:1357–1365.

678   52.   Tedersoo L, Bahram M, Põlme S, Kõljalg U, Yorou NS, Wijesundera R, Villarreal Ruiz

679   L, Vasco-Palacios AM, Thu PQ, Suija A, Smith ME, Sharp C, Saluveer E, Saitta A,

680   Rosas M, Riit T, Ratkowsky D, Pritsch K, Põldmaa K, Piepenbring M, Abarenkov K.

681   2014. Fungal biogeography. Global diversity and geography of soil fungi. Science

682   346:1256688.

683   53.   Chau JF, Bagtzoglou AC, Willig MR. 2011. The effect of soil texture on richness and

684   diversity of bacterial communities. Environmental Forensics 12:333–341.

685   54.   Kaiser K, Wemheuer B, Korolkow V, Wemheuer F, Nacke H, Schöning I, Schrumpf M,

686   Daniel R. 2016. Driving forces of soil bacterial community structure, diversity, and

687   function in temperate grasslands and forests. Sci Rep 6:33696.

688   55.   Allison SD, Horner-Devine MC. 2011. Drivers of bacterial β-diversity depend on spatial

689   scale. Proceedings of the ….

690   56.   Kerr B, Riley MA, Feldman MW, Bohannan BJM. 2002. Local dispersal promotes

691   biodiversity in a real-life game of rock-paper-scissors. Nature 418:171–174.

692   57.   Manzoni S, Schimel JP, Porporato A. 2012. Responses of soil microbial communities to

693   water stress: results from a meta-analysis. Ecology 93:930–938.

694   58.   Lozupone CA, Knight R. 2007. Global patterns in bacterial diversity. Proc Natl Acad Sci

695   USA 104:11436–11440.

59.   Philippot L, Raaijmakers JM, Lemanceau P, van der Putten WH. 2013. Going back to

the roots: the microbial ecology of the rhizosphere. Nat Rev Microbiol 11:789–799.

60.   Shade A, Caporaso JG, Handelsman J, Knight R, Fierer N. 2013. A meta-analysis of

changes in bacterial and archaeal communities with time. ISME J 7:1493–1506.

61.   Graham EB, Knelman JE, Schindlbacher A, Siciliano S, Breulmann M, Yannarell A,

Beman JM, Abell G, Philippot L, Prosser J, Foulquier A, Yuste JC, Glanville HC, Jones

DL, Angel R, Salminen J, Newton RJ, Bürgmann H, Ingram LJ, Hamer U, Nemergut

DR. 2016. Microbes as engines of ecosystem function: when does community structure

enhance predictions of ecosystem processes? Front Microbiol 7:214.

62.   Malik AA, Martiny JBH, Brodie EL, Martiny AC, Treseder KK, Allison SD. 2020.

Defining trait-based microbial strategies with consequences for soil carbon cycling

under climate change. ISME J 14:1–9.

63.   van der Heijden MGA, Bardgett RD, van Straalen NM. 2008. The unseen majority: soil

microbes as drivers of plant diversity and productivity in terrestrial ecosystems. Ecol

Lett 11:296–310.

64.   Strickland MS, Lauber C, Fierer N, Bradford MA. 2009. Testing the functional

significance of microbial community composition. Ecology 90:441–451.

65.   Schimel JP, Schaeffer SM. 2012. Microbial control over carbon cycling in soil. Front

Microbiol 3:348.

66.   Green JL, Bohannan BJM, Whitaker RJ. 2008. Microbial biogeography: from taxonomy

to traits. Science 320:1039–1043.

67.   Caldwell BA. 2005. Enzyme activities as a component of soil biodiversity: A review.

Pedobiologia 49:637–644.

68.   Six J, Frey SD, Thiet RK, Batten KM. 2006. Bacterial and Fungal Contributions to

Carbon Sequestration in Agroecosystems. Soil Sci Soc Am J 70:555.

69.   Naeem S, Wright JP. 2003. Disentangling biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning:

deriving solutions to a seemingly insurmountable problem. Ecol Lett 6:567–579.

70.   Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, Hooper DU, Perrings C, Venail P, Narwani A,

Mace GM, Tilman D, Wardle DA, Kinzig AP, Daily GC, Loreau M, Grace JB,

Larigauderie A, Srivastava DS, Naeem S. 2012. Biodiversity loss and its impact on

humanity. Nature 486:59–67.

71.   Ladau J, Shi Y, Jing X, He J-S, Chen L, Lin X, Fierer N, Gilbert JA, Pollard KS, Chu H.

2018. Existing climate change will lead to pronounced shifts in the diversity of soil

prokaryotes. mSystems 3.

72.   Banerjee S, Schlaeppi K, van der Heijden MGA. 2018. Keystone taxa as drivers of

microbiome structure and functioning. Nat Rev Microbiol 16:567–576.

73.   Banerjee S, Kirkby CA, Schmutter D, Bissett A, Kirkegaard JA, Richardson AE. 2016.

Network analysis reveals functional redundancy and keystone taxa amongst bacterial

and fungal communities during organic matter decomposition in an arable soil. Soil Biol

Biochem 97:188–198.

74.   Neu AT, Allen EE, Roy K. 2021. Defining and quantifying the core microbiome:

Challenges and prospects. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 118.

75.   Bay SK, McGeoch MA, Gillor O, Wieler N, Palmer DJ, Baker DJ, Chown SL, Greening

C. 2020. Soil bacterial communities exhibit strong biogeographic patterns at fine

taxonomic resolution. mSystems 5.

76. de Wit R, Bouvier T. 2006. "Everything is everywhere, but, the environment selects";

what did Baas Becking and Beijerinck really say? Environ Microbiol 8:755–758.

77. Bowman MM, Heath AE, Varga T, Battu AK, Chu RK, Toyoda J, Cheeke TE, Porter

SS, Moffett KB, LeTendre B, Qafoku O, Bargar JR, Mans DM, Hess NJ, Graham EB.

2023. One thousand soils for molecular understanding of belowground carbon cycling.

Front Soil Sci 3.

78. Keller M, Schimel DS, Hargrove WW, Hoffman FM. 2008. A continental strategy for

the National Ecological Observatory Network. Frontiers in Ecology and the

Environment 6:282–284.

79. Aoki-Kinoshita KF, Kanehisa M. 2007. Gene annotation and pathway mapping in

KEGG. Methods Mol Biol 396:71–91.

80. Kanehisa M, Goto S, Kawashima S, Okuno Y, Hattori M. 2004. The KEGG resource for

deciphering the genome. Nucleic Acids Res 32:D277-80.

81. El-Gebali S, Mistry J, Bateman A, Eddy SR, Luciani A, Potter SC, Qureshi M,

Richardson LJ, Salazar GA, Smart A, Sonnhammer ELL, Hirsh L, Paladin L, Piovesan

D, Tosatto SCE, Finn RD. 2019. The Pfam protein families database in 2019. Nucleic

Acids Res 47:D427–D432.

82. Haft DH, Selengut JD, Richter RA, Harkins D, Basu MK, Beck E. 2013. Tigrfams and

genome properties in 2013. Nucleic Acids Res 41:D387-95.

83. Huntemann M, Ivanova NN, Mavromatis K, Tripp HJ, Paez-Espino D, Palaniappan K,

Szeto E, Pillay M, Chen I-MA, Pati A, Nielsen T, Markowitz VM, Kyrpides NC. 2015.

The standard operating procedure of the DOE-JGI Microbial Genome Annotation

Pipeline (MGAP v.4). Stand Genomic Sci 10:86.

84. Freitas TAK, Li P-E, Scholz MB, Chain PSG. 2015. Accurate read-based metagenome

characterization using a hierarchical suite of unique signatures. Nucleic Acids Res

43:e69.

85. Taylor BL, Zhulin IB. 1999. PAS domains: internal sensors of oxygen, redox potential,

and light. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 63:479–506.

86. Alster CJ, von Fischer JC, Allison SD, Treseder KK. 2020. Embracing a new paradigm

for temperature sensitivity of soil microbes. Glob Chang Biol 26:3221–3229.

87. Wang C, Morrissey EM, Mau RL, Hayer M, Piñeiro J, Mack MC, Marks JC, Bell SL,

Miller SN, Schwartz E, Dijkstra P, Koch BJ, Stone BW, Purcell AM, Blazewicz SJ,

Hofmockel KS, Pett-Ridge J, Hungate BA. 2021. The temperature sensitivity of soil:

microbial biodiversity, growth, and carbon mineralization. ISME J 15:2738–2747.

88. Fierer N, Leff JW, Adams BJ, Nielsen UN, Bates ST, Lauber CL, Owens S, Gilbert JA,

Wall DH, Caporaso JG. 2012. Cross-biome metagenomic analyses of soil microbial

communities and their functional attributes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109:21390–21395.

89. Freschet GT, Valverde-Barrantes OJ, Tucker CM, Craine JM, McCormack ML, Violle

C, Fort F, Blackwood CB, Urban-Mead KR, Iversen CM, Bonis A, Comas LH,

Cornelissen JHC, Dong M, Guo D, Hobbie SE, Holdaway RJ, Kembel SW, Makita N,

Onipchenko VG, Roumet C. 2017. Climate, soil and plant functional types as drivers of

global fine-root trait variation. J Ecol 105:1182–1196.

90. Zheng Q, Hu Y, Zhang S, Noll L, Böckle T, Dietrich M, Herbold CW, Eichorst SA,

Woebken D, Richter A, Wanek W. 2019. Soil multifunctionality is affected by the soil

environment and by microbial community composition and diversity. Soil Biol Biochem

136:107521.

91.   Espeleta JF, Cardon ZG, Mayer KU, Neumann RB. 2017. Diel plant water use and

competitive soil cation exchange interact to enhance NH4   + and K+ availability

in the rhizosphere. Plant Soil 414:33–51.

92.   Hall EK, Bernhardt ES, Bier RL, Bradford MA, Boot CM, Cotner JB, Del Giorgio PA,

Evans SE, Graham EB, Jones SE, Lennon JT, Locey KJ, Nemergut D, Osborne BB,

Rocca JD, Schimel JP, Waldrop MP, Wallenstein MD. 2018. Understanding how

microbiomes influence the systems they inhabit. Nat Microbiol 3:977–982.

93.   Graham EB, Crump AR, Resch CT, Fansler S, Arntzen E, Kennedy DW, Fredrickson

JK, Stegen JC. 2016. Coupling spatiotemporal community assembly processes to

changes in microbial metabolism. Front Microbiol 7:1949.

94.   Liu W, Graham EB, Dong Y, Zhong L, Zhang J, Qiu C, Chen R, Lin X, Feng Y. 2021.

Balanced stochastic versus deterministic assembly processes benefit diverse yet uneven

ecosystem functions in representative agroecosystems. Environ Microbiol 23:391–404.

95.   Liu W, Graham EB, Zhong L, Zhang J, Li W, Li Z, Lin X, Feng Y. 2020. Dynamic

microbial assembly processes correspond to soil fertility in sustainable paddy

agroecosystems. Funct Ecol 34:1244–1256.

96.   Waring BG, Sulman BN, Reed S, Smith AP, Averill C, Creamer CA, Cusack DF, Hall

SJ, Jastrow JD, Jilling A, Kemner KM, Kleber M, Liu X-JA, Pett-Ridge J, Schulz M.

2020. From pools to flow: The PROMISE framework for new insights on soil carbon

cycling in a changing world. Glob Chang Biol 26:6631–6643.

97.   McCarter CPR, Rezanezhad F, Quinton WL, Gharedaghloo B, Lennartz B, Price J,

Connon R, Van Cappellen P. 2020. Pore-scale controls on hydrological and geochemical

processes in peat: Implications on interacting processes. Earth-Science Reviews

207:103227.

98.   Ruamps LS, Nunan N, Chenu C. 2011. Microbial biogeography at the soil pore scale.

Soil Biol Biochem 43:280–286.

99.   Mares MA. 2017. Encyclopedia of deserts. books.google.com.

100.   Hagin J, Hadas A. 1962. Solubility of calcium phosphate in calcareous soils. Nature

193:1211–1212.

101.   Dick WA, Cheng L, Wang P. 2000. Soil acid and alkaline phosphatase activity as pH

adjustment indicators. Soil Biol Biochem 32:1915–1919.

102.   Krämer S. 2000. Acid and alkaline phosphatase dynamics and their relationship to soil

microclimate in a semiarid woodland. Soil Biol Biochem 32:179–188.

103.   Oliverio AM, Bissett A, McGuire K, Saltonstall K, Turner BL, Fierer N. 2020. The role

of phosphorus limitation in shaping soil bacterial communities and their metabolic

capabilities. MBio 11.

104.   Laliberté E, Zemunik G, Turner BL. 2014. Environmental filtering explains variation in

plant diversity along resource gradients. Science 345:1602–1605.

105.   Baya AM, Boethling RS, Ramos-Cormenzana A. 1981. Vitamin production in relation

to phosphate solubilization by soil bacteria. Soil Biol Biochem 13:527–531.

106.   Pii Y, Mimmo T, Tomasi N, Terzano R, Cesco S, Crecchio C. 2015. Microbial

828   interactions in the rhizosphere: beneficial influences of plant growth-promoting

829   rhizobacteria on nutrient acquisition process. A review. Biol Fertil Soils 51:403–415.

830   107.   Guerini D. 1998. The Ca2+ pumps and the Na+/Ca2+ exchangers. Biometals 11:319–

831   330.

832   108.   Cabello P, Luque-Almagro VM, Roldán MD, Moreno-Vivián C. 2019. Nitrogen

833   CycleReference module in life sciences. Elsevier.

834   109.   Pal RR, Khardenavis AA, Purohit HJ. 2015. Identification and monitoring of

835   nitrification and denitrification genes in Klebsiella pneumoniae EGD-HP19-C for its

836   ability to perform heterotrophic nitrification and aerobic denitrification. Funct Integr

837   Genomics 15:63–76.

838   110.   Padhi SK, Tripathy S, Sen R, Mahapatra AS, Mohanty S, Maiti NK. 2013.

839   Characterisation of heterotrophic nitrifying and aerobic denitrifying Klebsiella

840   pneumoniae CF-S9 strain for bioremediation of wastewater. Int Biodeterior

841   Biodegradation 78:67–73.

842   111.   Hastrup ACS, Green F, Lebow PK, Jensen B. 2012. Enzymatic oxalic acid regulation

843   correlated with wood degradation in four brown-rot fungi. Int Biodeterior

844   Biodegradation 75:109–114.

845   112.   Mäkelä M, Galkin S, Hatakka A, Lundell T. 2002. Production of organic acids and

846   oxalate decarboxylase in lignin-degrading white rot fungi. Enzyme Microb Technol

847   30:542–549.

113.   Takao S. 1965. Organic acid production by Basidiomycetes. I. Screening of acid-

producing strains. Appl Microbiol 13:732–737.

114. Baldrian P, Valásková V. 2008. Degradation of cellulose by basidiomycetous fungi.

FEMS Microbiol Rev 32:501–521.

115. Lu X, Heal KR, Ingalls AE, Doxey AC, Neufeld JD. 2020. Metagenomic and chemical

characterization of soil cobalamin production. ISME J 14:53–66.

116. Lauber CL, Hamady M, Knight R, Fierer N. 2009. Pyrosequencing-based assessment of

soil pH as a predictor of soil bacterial community structure at the continental scale. Appl

Environ Microbiol 75:5111–5120.

117. Carson JK, Gonzalez-Quiñones V, Murphy DV, Hinz C, Shaw JA, Gleeson DB. 2010.

Low pore connectivity increases bacterial diversity in soil. Appl Environ Microbiol

76:3936–3942.

118. He L, Xu X. 2021. Mapping soil microbial residence time at the global scale. Glob

Chang Biol 27:6484–6497.

119. Bueno de Mesquita CP, Wu D, Tringe SG. 2023. Methyl-Based Methanogenesis: an

Ecological and Genomic Review. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 87:e0002422.

120. Machado A, Cerca N. 2015. Influence of Biofilm Formation by Gardnerella vaginalis

and Other Anaerobes on Bacterial Vaginosis. J Infect Dis 212:1856–1861.

121. Grosche A, Sekaran H, Pérez-Rodríguez I, Starovoytov V, Vetriani C. 2015. Cetia

pacifica gen. nov., sp. nov., a chemolithoautotrophic, thermophilic, nitrate-ammonifying

bacterium from a deep-sea hydrothermal vent. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 65:1144–1150.

122. Shelobolina ES, Sullivan SA, O'Neill KR, Nevin KP, Lovley DR. 2004. Isolation,

characterization, and U(VI)-reducing potential of a facultatively anaerobic, acid-resistant

Bacterium from Low-pH, nitrate- and U(VI)-contaminated subsurface sediment and

description of Salmonella subterranea sp. nov. Appl Environ Microbiol 70:2959–2965.

123. Nichols CM, Bowman JP, Guezennec J. 2005. Olleya marilimosa gen. nov., sp. nov., an

exopolysaccharide-producing marine bacterium from the family Flavobacteriaceae,

isolated from the Southern Ocean. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 55:1557–1561.

124. Robinson IM, Allison MJ, Hartman PA. 1975. Anaeroplasma abactoclasticum gen.nov.,

sp.nov.: an Obligately Anaerobic Mycoplasma from the Rumen. Int J Syst Bacteriol

25:173–181.

125. Stewart V. 1993. Nitrate regulation of anaerobic respiratory gene expression in

Escherichia coli. Mol Microbiol 9:425–434.

126. Hung C-H, Chang Y-T, Chang Y-J. 2011. Roles of microorganisms other than

Clostridium and Enterobacter in anaerobic fermentative biohydrogen production

systems--a review. Bioresour Technol 102:8437–8444.

127. Chung EJ, Park TS, Jeon CO, Chung YR. 2012. Chitinophaga oryziterrae sp. nov.,

isolated from the rhizosphere soil of rice (Oryza sativa L.). Int J Syst Evol Microbiol

62:3030–3035.

128. Jin D, Kong X, Wang J, Sun J, Yu X, Zhuang X, Deng Y, Bai Z. 2018. Chitinophaga

caeni sp. nov., isolated from activated sludge. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 68:2209–2213.

129. Voigt C, Lamprecht RE, Marushchak ME, Lind SE, Novakovskiy A, Aurela M,

Martikainen PJ, Biasi C. 2017. Warming of subarctic tundra increases emissions of all

three important greenhouse gases - carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Glob

Chang Biol 23:3121–3138.

130.   Xue K, M. Yuan M, J. Shi Z, Qin Y, Deng Y, Cheng L, Wu L, He Z, Van Nostrand JD,

Bracho R, Natali S, Schuur EdwardAG, Luo C, Konstantinidis KT, Wang Q, Cole JR,

Tiedje JM, Luo Y, Zhou J. 2016. Tundra soil carbon is vulnerable to rapid microbial

decomposition under climate warming. Nat Clim Chang 6:595–600.

131.   Rößger N, Sachs T, Wille C, Boike J, Kutzbach L. 2022. Seasonal increase of methane

emissions linked to warming in Siberian tundra. Nat Clim Chang 12:1031–1036.

132.   Zona D, Gioli B, Commane R, Lindaas J, Wofsy SC, Miller CE, Dinardo SJ, Dengel S,

Sweeney C, Karion A, Chang RY-W, Henderson JM, Murphy PC, Goodrich JP,

Moreaux V, Liljedahl A, Watts JD, Kimball JS, Lipson DA, Oechel WC. 2016. Cold

season emissions dominate the Arctic tundra methane budget. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA

113:40–45.

133.   Yang G, Peng Y, Marushchak ME, Chen Y, Wang G, Li F, Zhang D, Wang J, Yu J, Liu

L, Qin S, Kou D, Yang Y. 2018. Magnitude and Pathways of Increased Nitrous Oxide

Emissions from Uplands Following Permafrost Thaw. Environ Sci Technol 52:9162–

9169.

134.   Marushchak ME, Kerttula J, Diáková K, Faguet A, Gil J, Grosse G, Knoblauch C,

Lashchinskiy N, Martikainen PJ, Morgenstern A, Nykamb M, Ronkainen JG, Siljanen

HMP, van Delden L, Voigt C, Zimov N, Zimov S, Biasi C. 2021. Thawing Yedoma

permafrost is a neglected nitrous oxide source. Nat Commun 12:7107.

135.   Bhattarai HR, Marushchak ME, Ronkainen J, Lamprecht RE, Siljanen HMP,

Martikainen PJ, Biasi C, Maljanen M. 2022. Emissions of atmospherically reactive gases

nitrous acid and nitric oxide from Arctic permafrost peatlands. Environmental Research

Letters 17:024034.

136.   Varsadiya M, Liebmann P, Petters S, Hugelius G, Urich T, Guggenberger G, Bárta J.

2022. Extracellular enzyme ratios reveal locality and horizon-specific carbon, nitrogen,

and phosphorus limitations in Arctic permafrost soils. Biogeochemistry 161:101–117.

137.   Zhang D, Wang L, Qin S, Kou D, Wang S, Zheng Z, Peñuelas J, Yang Y. 2023.

Microbial nitrogen and phosphorus co-limitation across permafrost region. Glob Chang

Biol 29:3910–3923.

138.   Yang G, Peng Y, Abbott BW, Biasi C, Wei B, Zhang D, Wang J, Yu J, Li F, Wang G,

Kou D, Liu F, Yang Y. 2021. Phosphorus rather than nitrogen regulates ecosystem

carbon dynamics after permafrost thaw. Glob Chang Biol 27:5818–5830.

139.   Emerson JB, Roux S, Brum JR, Bolduc B, Woodcroft BJ, Jang HB, Singleton CM,

Solden LM, Naas AE, Boyd JA, Hodgkins SB, Wilson RM, Trubl G, Li C, Frolking S,

Pope PB, Wrighton KC, Crill PM, Chanton JP, Saleska SR, Sullivan MB. 2018. Host-

linked soil viral ecology along a permafrost thaw gradient. Nat Microbiol 3:870–880.

140.   Wu R, Bottos EM, Danna VG, Stegen JC, Jansson JK, Davison MR. 2022. RNA viruses

linked to eukaryotic hosts in thawed permafrost. mSystems 7:e0058222.

141.   Wu R, Trubl G, Taş N, Jansson JK. 2022. Permafrost as a potential pathogen reservoir.

One Earth 5:351–360.

142.   Rigou S, Santini S, Abergel C, Claverie J-M, Legendre M. 2022. Past and present giant

viruses diversity explored through permafrost metagenomics. Nat Commun 13:5853.

143.   Lee S, Sieradzki ET, Nicolas AM, Walker RL, Firestone MK, Hazard C, Nicol GW.

2021. Methane-derived carbon flows into host-virus networks at different trophic levels

in soil. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 118.

144.   Nickson R, McArthur J, Burgess W, Ahmed KM, Ravenscroft P, Rahmanñ M. 1998.

Arsenic poisoning of Bangladesh groundwater. Nature 395:338–338.

145.   Gransee A, Führs H. 2013. Magnesium mobility in soils as a challenge for soil and plant

analysis, magnesium fertilization and root uptake under adverse growth conditions. Plant

Soil 368:5–21.

146.   Knelman JE, Schmidt SK, Graham EB. 2021. Cyanobacteria in early soil development

of deglaciated forefields: Dominance of non-heterocytous filamentous cyanobacteria and

phosphorus limitation of N-fixing Nostocales. Soil Biol Biochem 154:108127.

147.   Knelman JE, Nemergut DR. 2014. Changes in community assembly may shift the

relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem function. Front Microbiol 5:424.

148.   Rocca JD, Hall EK, Lennon JT, Evans SE, Waldrop MP, Cotner JB, Nemergut DR,

Graham EB, Wallenstein MD. 2015. Relationships between protein-encoding gene

abundance and corresponding process are commonly assumed yet rarely observed.

ISME J 9:1693–1699.

149.   Storch D, Šizling AL. 2008. The Concept of Taxon Invariance in Ecology: Do Diversity

Patterns Vary with Changes in Taxonomic Resolution? Folia Geobot 43:329–344.

150.   Hanson CA, Fuhrman JA, Horner-Devine MC, Martiny JBH. 2012. Beyond

biogeographic patterns: processes shaping the microbial landscape. Nat Rev Microbiol

10:497–506.

151.   Martiny JBH, Jones SE, Lennon JT, Martiny AC. 2015. Microbiomes in light of traits: A

phylogenetic perspective. Science 350:aac9323.

152.   Robinson MD, Oshlack A. 2010. A scaling normalization method for differential

expression analysis of RNA-seq data. Genome Biol 11:R25.

153.   Olson DM, Dinerstein E, Wikramanayake ED, Burgess ND, Powell GVN, Underwood

EC, D'amico JA, Itoua I, Strand HE, Morrison JC, Loucks CJ, Allnutt TF, Ricketts TH,

Kura Y, Lamoreux JF, Wettengel WW, Hedao P, Kassem KR. 2001. Terrestrial

ecoregions of the world: A new map of life on earth. Bioscience 51:933.

154.   Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World | Publications | WWF.

155.   Hengl T, Mendes de Jesus J, Heuvelink GBM, Ruiperez Gonzalez M, Kilibarda M,

Blagotić A, Shangguan W, Wright MN, Geng X, Bauer-Marschallinger B, Guevara MA,

Vargas R, MacMillan RA, Batjes NH, Leenaars JGB, Ribeiro E, Wheeler I, Mantel S,

Kempen B. 2017. SoilGrids250m: Global gridded soil information based on machine

learning. PLoS ONE 12:e0169748.

156.   R Core Team. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Computer

software, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

157.   Kuhn M. 2008. Building Predictive Models in *R* Using the caret Package. J Stat Softw

28.

158.   Zeileis A, Leisch F, Hornik K, Kleiber C. 2002. strucchange : an *r* package for testing

for structural change in linear regression models. J Stat Softw 7.

159.   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P. 2013. Package "vegan." Community

ecology ….

160.   Wood S, Wood MS. 2015. Package "mgcv." R package version.

161.   Maechler M, Rousseeuw P, Struyf A, Hubert M. 2013. Package "cluster." Dosegljivo na.

162.   Kodinariya TM, Makwana PR. 2013. Review on determining number of Cluster in K-
982   Means Clustering. International Journal.

983   163.   Wickham H, Chang W. 2016. Package "ggplot2." Create elegant data ….

984   164.   2023. A Grammar of Data Manipulation [R package dplyr version 1.1.2].

985   165.   Kassambara A, Mundt F. 2017. Package "factoextra." Extract and visualize the results of
986   multivariate ….

987   166.   Jr FH, Jr MH. 2019. Package "hmisc." CRAN2018.

988   167.   Zeileis A, Fisher JC, Hornik K, Ihaka R, McWhite CD, Murrell P, Stauffer R, Wilke
989   CO. 2020. colorspace : A toolbox for manipulating and assessing colors and palettes. J
990   Stat Softw 96.

991   168.   Neuwirth E, Neuwirth ME. 2014. Package "RColorBrewer." ColorBrewer Palettes.

992   169.   Auguie B, Antonov A, Auguie MB. 2017. Package "gridExtra." Miscellaneous
993   Functions for " ….

994   170.   Wickham H, Wickham MH. 2017. Package tidyverse. Easily install and load the
995   'Tidyverse.

996   171.   Becker RA, Wilks AR, Brownrigg R, Minka TP. maps: Draw geographical maps.

997   172.   phyloT : a phylogenetic tree generator.

998   173.   Yu G, Smith DK, Zhu H, Guan Y, Lam TTY. 2016. ggtree: An R package for
999   visualization and annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other
1000   associated data. Methods Ecol Evol 8:28–36.

174.   Wang L-G, Lam TT-Y, Xu S, Dai Z, Zhou L, Feng T, Guo P, Dunn CW, Jones BR,

Bradley T, Zhu H, Guan Y, Jiang Y, Yu G. 2020. Treeio: An R Package for

Phylogenetic Tree Input and Output with Richly Annotated and Associated Data. Mol

Biol Evol 37:599–603.

175.   Campitelli E. 2020. ggnewscale: Multiple Fill and Colour Scales in'ggplot2'. R package

version 04.

176.   Kolde R, Kolde MR. 2018. Package "pheatmap." R Package.