



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal hyphae reduce soil erosion by surface water flow in a greenhouse experiment

Mardhiah, U., Caruso, T., Gurnell, A., & Rillig, M. C. (2016). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal hyphae reduce soil erosion by surface water flow in a greenhouse experiment. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 99, 137-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.11.027>

Published in:
Applied Soil Ecology

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2015 Elsevier B.V.. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>, which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access

This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

1 **Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal hyphae reduce soil erosion by surface water flow in**
2 **a greenhouse experiment**

3

4 Ulfah Mardhiah^{1,2*}, Tancredi Caruso³, Angela Gurnell⁴, Matthias C. Rillig^{1,2}

5

6 ¹ Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Biologie, Plant Ecology, Altensteinstr. 6, D-14195,
7 Berlin, Germany

8 ² Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced Biodiversity Research (BBIB), D-14195
9 Berlin, Germany

10 ³ Queen's University of Belfast, School of Biological Sciences and Institute for Global
11 Food Security, 97 Lisburn Road, BT9 7BL, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom

12 ⁴ Queen Mary, University of London, School of Geography, Mile End Road, E1 4NS,
13 London, United Kingdom

14

15

16 *Corresponding author

17 Ulfah Mardhiah, Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Biologie, Plant Ecology,
18 Altensteinstr. 6, D-14195, Berlin, Germany

19 Tel ++49 30 838 53143; fax – 53886; umardhiah@zedat.fu-berlin.de

20

21 Abstract

22

23 The role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in resisting surface flow soil erosion has

24 never been tested experimentally. We set up a full factorial greenhouse experiment using
25 *Achillea millefolium* with treatments consisting of addition of AMF inoculum and non-
26 microbial filtrate, non-AMF inoculum and microbial filtrate, AMF inoculum and
27 microbial filtrate, and non-AMF inoculum and non-microbial filtrate (control) which
28 were subjected to a constant shear stress in the form of surface water flow to quantify the
29 soil detachment rate through time. We found that soil loss can be explained by the
30 combined effect of roots and AMF extraradical hyphae and we could disentangle the
31 unique effect of AMF hyphal length, which significantly reduced soil loss, highlighting
32 their potential importance in riparian systems.

33

34 Keywords: Soil erosion, concentrated flow, soil detachment rate, AMF

35

36 The rate of soil loss by erosion has been accelerated due to various human activities at a
37 global scale (Grimm *et al.*, 2002), with negative effects including loss of topsoil, decrease
38 in soil organic matter, and pollution of surface waters (Lal, 2001). Soil erosion is related
39 to the susceptibility of soil to both detachment and transport of soil particles (Gyssels *et*
40 *al.*, 2005). Vegetation biomass, both above and belowground, has been identified to play a
41 role in decreasing soil erosion (Prosser *et al.*, 1995; Gyssels and Poesen, 2003). The role
42 of soil biota has not often been subjected to empirical tests, but it is assumed that
43 members of the soil biota indirectly decrease soil erosion through the formation and
44 stabilization of soil aggregates (Tisdall and Oades, 1982; Rillig and Mummey, 2006). For
45 example, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) are root associated fungi known for their
46 role in increasing soil aggregation (Tisdall and Oades, 1982; Mardhiah *et al.*, 2014;

47 Leifheit *et al.*, 2014) through their extended extraradical hyphae in the rhizosphere
48 (Tisdall and Oades, 1982; Rillig and Mummey, 2006) and by stimulating root growth
49 (Bearden and Petersen, 2000).

50

51 In order to quantify the role of AMF hyphae in reducing soil erosion, we measured at the
52 end of a greenhouse experiment the difference in soil detachment rate ($\text{g soil } 10 \text{ s}^{-1}$) under
53 a constant flow of water across a fixed area of soil surface (63.6 cm^2) at successive points
54 in time, comparing different treatments (AMF treatment, microbial filtrate treatment,
55 AMF and microbial filtrate treatment and control). *Achillea millefolium* seeds were
56 surface sterilized in 70% ethanol and 5% commercial bleach. We added 5 seeds per pot
57 and then thinned to two plants per pot. We used a sandy loam alluvial soil (73% sand,
58 18% silt and 7% clay (Rillig *et al.*, 2010)), which was autoclaved twice (121°C , 20
59 minutes) and was re-mixed before placing into each pot (1.3 kg of soil per pot). Pots in
60 AMF treatments received 150 *Glomus intraradices* (*Rhizophagus irregularis*) spores;
61 non-AMF treatment pots received the same amount of sterile carrier material. We
62 prepared the microbial filtrate, which might introduce saprobic fungi and bacteria, by
63 passing a suspension of the soil used in the study (200 g L^{-1}) through a $20 \mu\text{m}$ size sieve
64 and used the slurry as microbial filtrate treatment. Pots in microbial filtrate treatments
65 received 2 ml of the slurry, while those in non-microbial filtrate treatment received the
66 same amount of sterile slurry. The greenhouse temperature was $16\text{-}22^\circ\text{C}$ and the
67 experiment lasted for ~ 23 weeks. The plants were of similar size by the end of the
68 experiment.

69

70 To measure the soil erosion due to water flowing over the soil surface, a hydraulic flume,
71 2 m in length and 0.1 m wide, was constructed using a transparent Plexi glass wall at the
72 University of Trento, Italy. At 20 cm before the end of the flume, a hole with a 9 cm
73 external diameter was created to hold the soil core. A sharpened PVC pipe (inner
74 diameter = 9 cm), made to fit the flume hole, was used as a corer and was carefully
75 placed at the centre of each of the pots and pushed through the soil from the top until it
76 reached the bottom of each pot. The corer was then pushed through from below and
77 towards the surface of the flume bottom using a piston so that the soil surface was
78 maintained in line with the flume bed through each experiment (Suppl. Mat. Figure S1).
79 The flume was set at a slope of 18°, and a flow of tap water was discharged into the flume
80 at a constant rate (0.0003 m³ s⁻¹). Mean flow velocity (1.17 ± 0.01 m s⁻¹) was measured
81 every day and yielded a mean flow shear stress on the soil surface of 7.75 Pa (Suppl. Mat.
82 Equation S1).
83
84 Ten replicate samples were prepared according to each treatment. Samples were prepared
85 with methods adjusted from De Baets *et al.* (2006). The samples were retained within a
86 constant water level environment (4.5 cm below the soil surface) to allow slow capillary
87 rise and all aboveground biomass was clipped. The samples were drained immediately
88 prior to being introduced to the flume, where they were subjected to a constant discharge
89 for 145 seconds. Following an initial flow period of 20 seconds, samples of the water
90 draining from the flume were taken every 15 seconds for 10 seconds, providing a total of
91 five successive 10 second samples (R1-R5). The samples were left to settle before
92 decanting the water, which was oven dried at 65°C and then the residue was weighed.

93 Soil which was left in the corer was carefully retained and dried. To ensure that
94 measurements of the soil left in the corer did not include soil and roots exposed by the
95 soil erosion experiment, we carefully scraped a thin layer of the surface layer off each
96 cored soil. After sieving the soil through a 4-mm sieve, aggregate stability was measured
97 by re-wetting 4.0 g of soil using capillary action and sieving for 5 minutes on a 250 μm
98 sieve before drying at 65°C. The dried material was then crushed and passed through the
99 sieve, separating the stable aggregates from the coarse fraction. Root biomass was
100 extracted and measured using an extraction-flotation method (Cook *et al.*, 1988). Root
101 length grouped by diameter (Barto *et al.*, 2010) was measured by analyzing scanned
102 images using WinRhizo Pro 2007d (Regent Instruments Inc., Quebec City, Canada).
103 Hyphae were extracted from 4.0 grams of dried soil using a protocol adapted from
104 Jakobsen *et al.* (1992) and then stained with Trypan Blue. AMF and non-AMF
105 extraradical hyphal length were measured according to Rillig *et al.* (1999).

106

107 We used the Kruskal Wallis test to quantify the difference of soil detachment rate (g soil
108 10 s^{-1}) between treatments at each of the five successive time points during the flume
109 experiments. We also ran linear models correlating total soil loss with soil detachment
110 rate determinants (percent water stable aggregates (% WSA), root biomass, very fine, fine
111 and coarse root length, AMF and non-AMF extraradical hyphal length) tested as main
112 effect and interaction. We calculated variation in partitioning of root biomass and AMF
113 extraradical hyphal length using redundancy analysis. All statistical analyses were
114 conducted using version 2.14.0 of the R statistics software (R Development Core Team,
115 2012).

116

117 In general, soil loss decreased through time (Suppl. Mat. Figure S2). A possible
118 explanation is that initially, relatively loose surface soil which came into contact with the
119 erosion flow was rapidly detached; soil loss then slowed, possibly because of more
120 intense effects of roots with or without fungal hyphae. We found that AMF treatments
121 decreased soil loss most effectively compared to the control (Figure 1). Total soil loss can
122 be explained by the joint effect of total root biomass (17%) and AMF extraradical hyphae
123 (16%) (Table 1). AMF extraradical hyphal length significantly decreased total soil loss
124 when used in linear models as a singular main effect and in interaction with root biomass
125 (Suppl. Mat. Table S1, Figure 2). This is to our knowledge, the first time that AMF
126 extraradical hyphal length has been shown to have a direct effect in reducing surface soil
127 erosion due to surface flow. The role of AMF seems to be due to the ability of AMF to
128 produce extraradical hyphae. The addition of microbial filtrate did not reduce the soil
129 detachment rate compared to the control and even reduced the effectiveness of AMF
130 treatment. We also did not find a significant difference of % WSA between treatments
131 (Suppl. Mat. Table S3) and no significant correlations between the soil detachment rate
132 and % WSA in our models (data not shown). This implies that soil aggregate stability in
133 our system was not an important factor for preventing soil erosion due to concentrated
134 flow. Studies showed that besides soil aggregates, microtopography (surface roughness)
135 and soil cohesion due to a dense root mat, can decrease surface soil erosion (Campbell
136 *et.al.*, 1989; Prosser *et al.*, 1995; Prosser and Dietrich, 1995; Hu *et al.*, 2002). Our study
137 implies that, rather than the role in formation or maintenance of stable soil aggregates, the
138 role of AMF hyphae -which might also include the formation of a hyphal network which

139 further increases soil cohesion- might be more important in reducing surface soil erosion.
140 Although the microbial filtrate might contain saprobic fungi which also produced hyphae,
141 their minimal effect towards reduced soil erosion in this study might imply that the
142 hyphae of both fungal groups behave differently. AMF tend to produce more persistent,
143 coarser and thicker extraradical hyphae compared to many saprobic fungal hyphae
144 (Klironomos and Kendrick, 1996; Klironomos *et al.*, 1999; Allen, 2006). Saprobian fungi
145 can also produce enzymes degrading soil carbon, an ability which AMF lack; this taken
146 together could explain the significant role of AMF in reducing soil erosion in our
147 experiment. Overall, our results highlight the role of AMF in potentially stabilizing soils
148 in riparian systems.

149

150 Acknowledgments

151

152 This research was funded by the SMART Joint Doctoral Programme (Erasmus Mundus
153 Programme of the European Union) and the DRS HONORS Fellowship programme of
154 Freie Universität Berlin. This study is a contribution to an EU Marie Curie Career
155 Integration Grant to T.C. (EC FP7 - 631399 - SENSE). We would like to thank Dr. Walter
156 Bertoldi and Dr. Marco Redolfi for providing the flume and for invaluable discussion on
157 the flume experiment. We would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their
158 invaluable input and comments.

159

160 References

161

162 Allen, M. F., 2006. Water dynamics of mycorrhizas in arid soils (pp. 74-97). Cambridge
163 University Press: New York, USA.
164

165 Barto, E.K., Alt, F., Oelmann, Y., Wilcke, W., Rillig, M.C., 2010. Contributions of biotic
166 and abiotic factors to soil aggregation across a land use gradient. *Soil Biology and*
167 *Biochemistry* 42, 2316–2324.
168

169 Bearden, B.N., Petersen, L., 2000. Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on soil
170 structure and aggregate stability of a vertisol. *Plant Soil*, 173–183.
171

172 Campbell, S.E., Seeler, J.S., Golubic, S., 1989. Desert crust formation and soil
173 stabilization. *Arid Land Research and Management* 3, 217-228.
174

175 Cook, B., Jastrow, J.D., Miller, R., 1988. Root and mycorrhizal endophyte development
176 in a chronosequence of restored tallgrass prairie. *New Phytologist* 110, 355–362.
177

178 De Baets, S., Poesen, J., Gyssels, G., Knapen, A., 2006. Effects of grass roots on the
179 erodibility of topsoils during concentrated flow. *Geomorphology* 76, 54–67.
180

181 Grimm, M., Jones, J., Montanarella, L., 2002. Soil Erosion Risk in Europe. European Soil
182 Bureau Research Report.
183

184 Gyssels, G., Poesen, J., 2003. The importance of plant root characteristics in controlling

185 concentrated flow erosion rates. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 28, 371-384.

186

187 Gyssels, G., Poesen, J., Bochet, E., Li, Y., 2005. Impact of plant roots on the resistance of
188 soils to erosion by water: a review. *Progress in Physical Geography* 29, 189–217.

189

190 Hu, C., Liu, Y., Song, L., Zhang, D., 2002. Effect of desert soil algae on the stabilization
191 of fine sands. *Journal of Applied Phycology* 14, 281-292.

192

193 Jakobsen, I., Abbott, L., Robson, A., 1992. External hyphae of vesicular-arbuscular
194 mycorrhizal fungi associated with *Trifolium subterraneum* L. *New Phytologist* 120,
195 371–380.

196

197 Klironomos, J. N., Kendrick, W. B., 1996. Palatability of microfungi to soil arthropods in
198 relation to the functioning of arbuscular mycorrhizae. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 21,
199 43-52.

200

201 Klironomos, J. N., Bednarczuk, E. M., Neville, J., 1999. Reproductive significance of
202 feeding on saprobic and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi by the collembolan, *Folsomia*
203 *candida*. *Functional Ecology* 13, 756-761.

204

205 Lal, R., 2001. Soil degradation by erosion. *Land Degradation and Development* 12, 519–
206 539.

207

208 Leifheit, E.F., Veresoglou, S.D., Lehmann, A., Morris, E.K., Rillig, M.C., 2014. Multiple
209 factors influence the role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in soil aggregation – a meta-
210 analysis. *Plant and Soil* 374, 523-537.

211

212 Mardhiah, U., Caruso, T., Gurnell, A., Rillig, M.C., 2014. Just a matter of time: Fungi and
213 roots significantly and rapidly aggregate soil over four decades along the Tagliamento
214 River, NE Italy. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 75, 133–142.

215

216 Prosser, I.P., Dietrich, W.E., Stevenson, J., 1995. Flow resistance and sediment transport
217 by concentrated overland flow in a grassland valley. *Geomorphology* 13, 71–86.

218

219 Prosser, I.P., Dietrich, W.E., 1995. Field experiments on erosion by overland flow and
220 their implication for a digital terrain model of channel initiation. *Water Resources*
221 *Research* 31, 2867-2876.

222

223 R Development Core Team, 2012. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*
224 *Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

225

226 Rillig, M.C., Field, C.B., Allen, M.F., 1999. Soil biota responses to long-term
227 atmospheric CO₂ enrichment in two California annual grasslands. *Oecologia* 119,
228 572-577.

229

230 Rillig, M.C., Mummey, D.L., 2006. Mycorrhizas and soil structure. *New Phytologist* 171,

231 41–53.

232

233 Rillig, M. C., Mardatin, N. F., Leifheit, E. F., Antunes, P. M., 2010. Mycelium of
234 arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi increases soil water repellency and is sufficient to maintain
235 water-stable soil aggregates. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 42, 1189-1191.

236

237 Tisdall, J., Oades, J., 1982. Organic matter and water-stable aggregates in soils. *Journal of*
238 *Soil Science* 33, 141–163.

239

240

241

242

243 Table 1. Variation partitioning based on redundancy analysis was used to explain the
 244 pattern of total soil loss in relation to explanatory variables: AMF extraradical hyphal
 245 length and root biomass. All percentages explained were significant (p-values < 0.05).

246

Response variable:	df	Fraction explained (%)
Total soil loss (g soil in 50 s)		
<i>Explanatory variables:</i>		
AMF extraradical hyphal length fraction (with covariable: root biomass)	1	16
Root biomass fraction (with covariable: AMF extraradical hyphal length)	1	17
Total	2	28
Shared fraction	0	4.1
Residuals	-	76
AMF extraradical hyphal length (without covariable)	1	9.7
Root biomass (without covariable)	1	10.2

247

248 Figure captions

249

250 Figure 1. Linear models fitted using the generalized least squares (GLS) method
 251 corrected for heterogeneity of variances (var = varIdent(form=~1|fcategorical)) were used
 252 to plot cumulative soil detachment rate through time (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5) for different
 253 treatments (“control”, “AMF treatment”, “AMF and microbial filtrate treatment” and
 254 “microbial filtrate treatment”). Figure shows fitted lines with significant differences
 255 between each treatment levels (Suppl. Mat. Table S2). Different symbols indicate
 256 different treatments (control = Δ , AMF treatment = \bullet , AMF and microbial filtrate
 257 treatment = \circ , microbial filtrate treatment = $+$). The highest data point (microbial filtrate
 258 treatment, ranging 12.15-30.03 g soil 10 s⁻¹, R1-R5) was omitted to enable clear
 259 visualization of data.

260

261

262 Figure 2. A linear model fitted using the generalized least square (GLS) method corrected
263 for heterogeneity of variances ($\text{var} = \text{varIdent}(\text{form}=\sim 1|\text{fcategorical})$) and spatial
264 autocorrelation was used to correlate total soil loss (y axis) to AMF extraradical hyphal
265 length (x axis).