

The CZ as an ecological problem: How the interplay of biotic and abiotic actors determines the functioning of Earth's living skin

S.A. Billings, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Kansas Biological Survey and Center for Ecological Research, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA 66047; sharon.billings@ku.edu; ORCID 0000-0003-1611-526X

P.L. Sullivan, College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Science, Oregon State University, OR, USA, 97331; pamela.sullivan@oregonstate.edu; ORCID 0000-0001-8780-8501

D. Hirmas, Department of Environmental Sciences, University of California Riverside, Riverside, CA USA, 92521; daniel.hirmas@ucr.edu; ORCID 0000-0002-1204-0638

J.B. Nippert, Division of Biology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS USA 66506; nippert@ksu.edu; ORCID 0000-0002-7939-342X

D. D. Richter, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC USA 27708; drichter@duke.edu; ORCID 0000-0003-3547-433X

Z. Brecheisen, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA 47907; zbrecheisen@gmail.com; ORCID 0000-0002-3712-1725

C.W. Cook, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC USA 27708; cwcook@duke.edu

E. Hauser, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Kansas Biological Survey and Center for Ecological Research, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA 66047; emhauser818@gmail.com; ORCID 0000-0003-3554-3489

An emerging recognition of the critical zone

Long before the term 'critical zone' (CZ) was coined by Gail Ashley (Jordan et al. 2001) to encompass Earth's biological and geological features from the top of the vegetative canopy to the depths of circulating groundwater, many scientists have recognized that both biotic and abiotic actors are centrally important for understanding many of Earth's most fundamental processes (Schaffer 2020). Scientists such as Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), Charles Darwin (1809-1882), Jacques-Joseph Ébelmen (1814-1852), Vasily Dokuchaev (1846-1903), Vladimir Vernadsky (1863-1945), Arthur Tansley (1871-1955), Hans Jenny (1899-1992), Robert Berner (1925-2015), and James Lovelock (1919-present) worked across centuries and continents to demonstrate how momentary- and molecular-scale biotic actions (e.g., photosynthesis, respiration, production of organic acids, root growth) generate powerful chemical and physical forces that when scaled up govern environmental conditions of the planet. Indeed, it was a botanist familiar with plants' consumption of CO₂ – Eunice Newton Foote – who first developed and published the concept of greenhouse gases warming the planet (Foote 1856; Sorenson 2011), an idea developed as well by John Tyndall (1861). Today, we can recognize how these individuals and their colleagues integrated a diversity of ideas from biotic and abiotic processes into their work, a hallmark of today's CZ science.

48
49 Tansley's introduction of the ecosystem concept (1935) offered an intellectual home for those
50 interested in the systemic interaction of biota with the abiotic (Richter and Billings 2015). Ecosystem
51 ecology, a particular branch of the broader field of ecology, is defined as the study of life as it interacts
52 with the abiotic world (Sher and Molles 2022). In the nearly 100 years since the coinage of 'ecosystem'
53 (Tansley 1935), this discipline has developed a literature, conceptual and mathematical models, and
54 subdisciplines that have enhanced our understanding of how the biotic and abiotic interact on Earth's
55 surface (e.g., Hutchinson 1940; Odum 1968; Bormann and Likens 1967; Markewitz et al. 1998; O'Neill
56 2001; Pataki et al. 2003; Lovett et al. 2006; Morford et al. 2016). Concomitant with these developments,
57 scientific institutions such as departmentally-organized universities and scientific societies, journals, and
58 funding agencies also evolved, promoting more disciplinary approaches to science (Richter et al. 2018a).
59 As a result, scientists began to face strong pressures to self-identify with particular disciplines. This
60 development countered the ecosystem approach, which is defined by its interdisciplinarity.

61
62 Perhaps because ecosystem ecology was linked by its name to other, purely biological subdisciplines of
63 ecology (e.g., population and community ecology), it has often been assumed to be a fundamentally
64 biological pursuit. Many contemporary ecosystem ecologists have been trained in and remain focused
65 on biologically-focused areas such as photosynthesis, plant respiration, microbial cycling of organic
66 matter, and plant-microbe interactions, and often lack training in the chemical, physical, and geologic
67 dimensions of ecosystems. One manifestation of this problem is the superficial coverage of the
68 belowground component of ecosystems (Mobley et al. 2015, Richter et al. 2018). This feature was noted
69 by Binkley (2006), who highlighted that reviews of the ecological literature omit mention of soil, the very
70 medium from which terrestrial ecosystems derive most of their required resources. Most ecological
71 studies of soil focus on soil microbes and fauna interacting with each other or their organo-substrates,
72 or on roots and their interactions with microbes – all important but largely biologically-focused
73 endeavors (e.g., Baldrian 2019; Hart et al. 2020).

74
75 This biological focus of many ecosystem-trained scientists and the institutions in which many function
76 can limit our understanding of the interactive nature of many Earth surface processes. Multiple
77 examples demonstrate this assertion. First, rock- and mineral-derived nutrients are critical factors
78 driving biological activity in terrestrial systems (Schlesinger and Bernhardt 2020); with the exception of
79 N, even nutrients derived from organic matter recycling originally are released from mineral weathering.
80 Second, the inherited geologic structures of bedrock strongly controls ecosystem water storage and
81 transmission to groundwater and streams (Leone et al., 2020). Third, landscape position and
82 geomorphological characteristics constrain light availability (Bilir et al. 2021). These well-studied
83 phenomena demonstrate the degree to which an ecosystem's ability to capture nutrients, water, and
84 light – and thus its productivity – is dictated by chemical and physical site characteristics.

85
86 A fourth phenomenon exemplifies an especially rapidly expanding branch of CZ science that, like the
87 first three, clearly links biotic and abiotic processes. Multiple investigations reveal the importance of
88 dust nutrient inputs to ecosystems as key promoters of ecosystem productivity. This feature of
89 terrestrial ecosystem nutrition has been known for years (e.g., Lovett 1994; Chadwick et al. 1999;
90 Soderberg Compton 2007), but recent CZ studies help expand this concept to more fully reveal the
91 importance of dust-derived inputs to many ecosystems. Where highly weathered soils would otherwise
92 promote relatively low productivity, dust can serve as an especially critical nutrient source (Gallardo et
93 al. 2020; Chadwick et al. 1999). In addition to inoculating recipient sites with dust-bound microbial
94 populations (Maltz et al. 2021), dust can travel great distances (Yu et al. 2015; Eger et al. 2013) to
95 provide nutrients like P to biota (Marcon et al. 2021; Vogel et al. 2021) at supply rates that can outpace

that of bedrock itself in some systems (Aciego et al. 2017). Dust also can influence soil structure (Derry and Chadwick 2007) and generate meaningful material thickness within soil profiles (Lin and Feng 2015; Marcon et al. 2021). Dust inputs are not an important source of nutrition in all systems (e.g., Uhlig et al. 2017), but the nutrient subsidies provided by dust in many may be sufficient to mitigate rock and mineral weathering that would otherwise supply nutrients. This echoes the hypothesis suggesting that OM-derived nutrients can mitigate rock and mineral weathering (Brantley et al. 2011). More broadly, evolution of dust-focused CZ literature rests within a concept central to ecosystem, and thus CZ, science – that nutrients are either obtained internally through *de novo* weathering or OM recycling, or from external sources, and that nutrient sources thus dictate weathering rates.

The interactive nature of many of Earth's CZ processes is further demonstrated by biological phenomena influencing multiple physical and chemical attributes of the CZ, going far beyond the role of vegetation as a key sink for atmospheric CO₂ and nutrients. Roots, for example, both help prevent erosion (Stone and Kalisz 1991) on timescales of seasons to decades and help promote soil creep over longer timescales (Pawlik 2013; Brantley et al. 2017). Roots and the soil microbial communities they nurture generate organic acids and CO₂ that contribute to the weathering of soil minerals and bedrock (Landeweert et al. 2001; Marschner and Rengel 2007; Hasenmueller et al. 2017). Roots and microbes are also capable of recycling organic matter-bound nutrients, mitigating subsequent weathering processes as nutrient demand is met partially by organic matter decay (Hauser et al. 2020). Holistic terrestrial ecosystem studies thus must embrace some combination of physical and chemical sciences (e.g., lithology, mineralogical weathering, physical geography, geomorphology, hydrology) along with the biological phenomena that interact with these features.

The emergence of the CZ paradigm (Jordan et al. 2001; Brantley et al. 2007) promoted an interdisciplinarity already evident in the works of scientists such as Humboldt and Darwin (Schaffer 2020; Richter and Billings 2020). The explicit linkage of the bio- and geosciences in CZ studies provides the scaffolding needed to address environmental puzzles at a diversity of scales (Billings and Sullivan 2020; Sullivan et al. 2021). Realization of the CZ approach is hardly trivial: Implementing studies that integrate the bio- and geosciences requires collaboration among practitioners who represent disciplinary siloes, speak distinct vocabularies, and view scientific puzzles through separate lenses (Richter et al. 2018a; Figure 1). These traits can impede even well-intentioned collaborations (Watson 2017). However, many lessons have emerged by bridging the bio- and geo-focused disciplines to examine the 'critical zone ecosystem' (Richter and Billings 2015).

Here, we describe findings that emphasize how life, emphasizing vegetation and microbes, responds to and shapes the physical environment in which it persists, yielding feedbacks for Earth's climate, primarily through modifications to hydrologic functioning. We focus on the interactions of biota and the physical and chemical features of soil pedons and landscapes as they drive ecosystem-scale hydrologic fluxes. We acknowledge that the flowpaths for soil water are also the same conduits through which soil gases flow (Jury and Horton 2004) and are thus key to understanding ecosystem functions (e.g., Hasenmueller et al. 2015). In the current work, we emphasize hydrologic flows due to their importance for vegetative water uptake and thus productivity, flows of soil organic C and nutrients, and soil weathering processes. These processes all reflect diverse disciplines that coalesce in Earth's soils (Figure 1). We focus on hydrologically-relevant features because of the long history of individual disciplines telling us about the large-scale importance of these processes, and because of emerging research highlighting the importance of the intersection of these disciplines for projecting future ecosystem functioning on a rapidly changing Earth. The knowledge we spotlight reveals Earth's CZ as a fundamentally ecological problem.

Soil and landscape constraints on CZ hydrologic functioning

Within a given climate regime, hydrologic function is strongly influenced by the properties of and interactions between biotic and abiotic components of the CZ (Black, 1997; Bennett and Klironomos, 2018; Dawson et al., 2020; Figure 2). Here we adopt a physically-oriented, catchment-scale definition for hydrologic function as the partitioning, storage, and discharge of water (Wagener et al., 2007; Wlostowski et al., 2020). Although different locations within the CZ contain both biotic and abiotic components, it is the interaction between these components in the soil environment that exerts a strong control on hydrologic function through its effect on soil hydraulic properties. This near-surface soil environment is subject to steep and dynamic energy and soil moisture gradients that drive the relatively rapid flux of water and the temporal variations in the direction and velocity of this flow (Weil and Brady 2017). As soil biota (*e.g.*, microorganisms, plant roots, and macrofauna) respond to these variable near-surfaces fluxes of water, they shape the organization of soil particles and pores (Sullivan et al. 2021) and thus influence the development of soil horizons especially within shallow depths where the soil biological activity is concentrated. This modification happens primarily through the production of soil organic C (SOC), the formation and stabilization of soil aggregates, and the direct and indirect creation of macropores that perforate the soil. However, the ability of biota to modify the soil environment is constrained by the physical and rheological properties of the material, which are largely controlled by soil texture.

Soil texture is important to the hydrologic functioning of the CZ because it directly affects the relative surface area of the soil and the soil pore-size distribution. Pore size (*i.e.*, effective pore diameter) and relative surface area control the affinity of water to the soil matrix and impart a potential energy to the soil water (*i.e.*, matric potential; Hillel, 1998). Matric potential, in combination with components such as gravitational and hydrostatic pressure potential, governs the total potential energy of the soil water. Differences in the total potential energy state drive infiltration and the movement of water through the CZ. Thus, texture strongly affects water flux through soil by governing potential energy gradients. Soil texture also affects the ability of the soil to conduct water because of its control over surface area and the porosity of the soil matrix (especially, pore size and tortuosity). That is, as the soil particle-size distribution becomes finer, so do the pores between those particles, reducing the hydraulic conductivity of the soil. As the soil dries, air is introduced, bounding the soil water between the air-water interface and surfaces of the soil particles; this modifies the lengths and tortuosity of the paths that the water must follow to move through the soil, further reducing the hydraulic conductivity (Jury and Horton, 2004). Therefore, soil texture—both on its own and in conjunction with degree of saturation of the soil—is critical for understanding the retention and flux of water in the CZ due to its influence on both the total potential energy gradient driving flow and the conductivity of the soil through which the water moves.

Macroporosity of the soil is another important determinant of fluxes of water through the CZ. Although there are different classifications of macropores that depend on their origin and shape, here we restrict our discussion to macropores that are large (often greater than a few hundred micrometers), planar or tubular, and continuous; these macropores function as potential pathways for the preferential transmission of water (Jarvis and Larsson, 2001; Giménez and Hirmas, 2017; Figure 2). Macropores of this type result from either biotic or abiotic processes in the soil. Abiotic processes include the drying and concomitant shrinkage of the soil matrix especially in fine-textured materials, the formation of aggregated structural units (*e.g.*, clay tactoids, clusters of clay and silt domains, and subsurface peds like angular blocks and prisms) due to the cohesion of the soil particles or precipitation of inorganic cements (*e.g.*, CaCO_3 , opaline Si, or Fe-oxides), and the reinforcement of preferential pathways by the

development of surface coatings (Thoma et al., 1992; Jarvis and Larsson, 2001). This latter process is largely due to the illuviation of clay (*e.g.*, argillans, expanded on below) or the reorientation of the soil fabric at the pore surface from mechanical pressures (*e.g.*, fabric hypocoatings; Stoops, 2003). Biotic processes responsible for the formation of macropores include the activity of fossorial fauna (Platt et al., 2016), the growth and subsequent decay of roots (Giménez and Hirmas, 2017), and the formation of stable aggregates through, for instance, the egestion of soil particles by earthworms (Johnson-Maynard and Strawn, 2016), enmeshing of particles by mycorrhizal fungi and fine roots (Jastrow et al., 1998; Rillig and Mummey, 2006), or secretion by soil microorganisms of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) that glue soil particles together (Costa et al., 2018).

Macropores created through the processes outlined above typically make up only a minor fraction of the soil volume, but have an inordinate effect on water flux through the soil in saturated and even unsaturated conditions (Watson and Luxmoore 1986; Nimmo 2012). The reason for this phenomenon is that volumetric flow through a pore is proportional to the fourth power of its radius (*i.e.*, Poiseuille's law). Watson and Luxmoore (1986) demonstrated this principle by reporting that, under ponded conditions, macropores may be responsible for 96% of the water flow though only accounting for 0.32% of the soil's volume. Where these macropores intersect the land surface (*e.g.*, open biopores or aggregated surface soil horizons), they are important for the infiltration of water into the soil and the potential for runoff generation, and, thus, the loss of sediments and nutrients through erosion (Beven and Germann, 1982; Smettem et al., 1991; Léonard et al., 2004). Recent findings have shown that soil macropores are sensitive to shifts in climate, likely driven by soil biota (Hirmas et al., 2018; Caplan et al., 2019). Given the large control over water flow that macropores exhibit, even small changes to these pores in response to climate is likely to affect the water cycle and the hydrologic function of the CZ via changes to infiltration, aquifer recharge, and the lateral redistribution of water by runoff (Hirmas et al., 2018).

As soils form in response to the addition, loss, transformation, and translocation of mass and energy, soil horizons develop that are distinguished from each other on the basis of macromorphological properties exhibited as color, consistence, texture, structure, and porosity (Schaetzl and Randall, 2005; Buol et al., 2011; Turk et al., 2012). Differences between vertically adjacent soil horizons in the expression of these latter properties create layered conditions that are important for water flow through the vadose zone. This is because the boundaries between horizons, especially if they are abrupt, can represent significant discontinuities in soil hydraulic conductivity and water content (Hillel, 1998). The discontinuities — for example, a coarse-textured A horizon above a clay-enriched Bt horizon — act to retard the rate of soil water infiltration due to the reduced saturated hydraulic conductivity of the lower compared to the upper layer (Radcliffe and Šimůnek, 2010). However, even in cases where fine-textured layers or horizons with concentrated organic matter overlie more conductive, coarse-textured materials (*e.g.*, an O horizon directly over an E horizon, or a clay-rich horizon over a sandy horizon), the boundary between these horizons forms an obstacle (often temporary) to the wetting front that reduces infiltration. This is due to the differences in potential energy of the soil water across the boundary of the two layers with the fine-textured material imparting a sufficiently lower total potential energy compared to the underlying layer (Radcliffe and Šimůnek, 2010). The water hangs at this boundary until the saturated zone behind the leading edge of the wetting front increases sufficiently for the added hydrostatic pressure to overcome the matric forces holding the water. In addition to effects on infiltration, differences in soil hydraulic properties through and across horizons strongly influence the generation of preferential flow (Dyck and Kachanoski, 2010).

At a broader scale, ecosystems, soils, and landforms coevolve to shape the soil-geomorphic properties of the landscape (Wysocki et al., 2012). For example, slope curvature affects soil thickness and the concentration/dispersion of surface water (e.g., Patton et al., 2018), and elevation controls snow accumulation, rainfall, and evapotranspiration (e.g., Wigmosta et al., 1994). These features and the soil properties discussed above all constrain the hydrologic functioning of the CZ by driving the lateral redistribution of water and sediments along topographic gradients from ridges to valleys and by controlling the radiative conditions, and, thus, the soil temperature, effective moisture, and ecological properties corresponding to land-surface aspect (Fan et al., 2019). The lateral fluxes of water along topographic gradients occur both at the land surface and within the subsurface, controlling the vertical distribution of plant-available water and, therefore, plant rooting depth across the landscape (Fan et al., 2017). Milne's (1936) concept of the soil catena that was used in part to explain different drainage classes along a hillslope (Wysocki et al., 2012) is especially useful for understanding this relationship. A catena is a chain of adjacent and geomorphologically-related soils along a hillslope, from summit to base, perpendicularly transecting the topographic contours (Schaetzl and Anderson, 2005). Within this framework, soil morphological differences at different hillslope positions are explained by the lateral and vertical fluxes of surface water, groundwater, and sediments. Indeed, catenas can be conceptualized as hillsheds that undergo soil creep (Brecheisen et al. 2021). The movement of soil material and redistribution of water from steeply sloping positions to the base of hillslopes give rise to textural differences on the landscape that control CZ hydrologic functioning such as soil water retention (Figure 3).

All of these soil and landscape physical constraints on CZ hydrologic functioning are both the product of, and influence, biotic functioning. Soil geomorphic properties of landforms, and the soil properties of soil profiles, strongly affect the lateral and vertical distribution of water and, thus, the distribution of vegetation across the landscape and the distribution of roots within a profile. However, the influence of vegetation on both surface and subsurface hydrology significantly affects landform evolution and soil formation as well (e.g., Williamson et al., 2006; Chamberlin et al., 2019). Indeed, rooting depths appear sensitive to the different vertical distributions of soil moisture that result from hillslope-driven fluxes (Fan et al., 2017) and the properties of a given profile. In well-drained summit positions, for instance, the pool of plant-available water is largely contained at relatively shallow depths (i.e., from the infiltration of rainwater) with the water table too deep for plant roots to access; this is in contrast to poorly-drained toeslope positions that favor wetland species due to the creation of permanent waterlogged conditions from a water table that is near or above the land surface at the base of the hillslope (Fan et al., 2017). Between these two ends of the hillslope, plant-rooting distributions are affected by the relative positions of infiltration-controlled soil moisture and the capillary fringe above the water table, with plant roots sensitive to the seasonal changes in water table depth in upper backslope and footslope positions (Fan et al., 2017). Thus, without a transdisciplinary knowledge base embracing geomorphology, soil science, and vegetation water uptake patterns, CZ water balance would remain poorly understood.

Roots as direct, biotic drivers of CZ hydrologic functioning

Ecohydrological considerations

Discerning root water uptake patterns must be informed by root biology and the soil and landscape constraints on soil physical properties described above. Historically, root water uptake has been the purview of ecophysiologists and ecosystem ecologists with training in ecophysiology, and to a certain extent soil physicists. However, plant water availability and root water uptake impose cascading influences on whole-CZ structure and function. It has long been recognized that the physical and biogeochemical changes that occur with changes in species composition and root architecture co-evolve

with topography, geology, soil, and climate to control the trajectory of catchment hydrology (*e.g.*, Harman & Troch 2014). Understanding such connections and non-linear feedbacks is particularly important as we confront the need to forecast Earth system evolution in the face of accelerating climate change and human perturbations (Sullivan et al. 2018a). Thus, in addition to the role of landscape position influencing system hydrology discussed above, we must also emphasize that vegetation plays a role in governing water flows as well.

With ample nutrient availability, vegetative growth tends to be optimized where water availability is balanced by evaporative demand (Roebroek et al., 2020). Though at the largest scale this is governed by the overall climate, within each climate zone, the local CZ (*e.g.*, the landscape features discussed above) exerts strong governance over water abundance and depth to the water table. If rooting networks are able to access this groundwater, plants can flourish in what might otherwise be sub-optimal conditions (Fan, 2015). This action can result in an altered position of the water table, even in low landscape positions, as plants meet their evaporative demands (Sullivan et al., 2011). The depth of this drawdown is a function of the soil's water holding capacity, which can be impacted by plant-induced clogging of pores, or perhaps pore generation (Sullivan et al., 2016). Thus, the relationship between vegetation and groundwater or water table position, and factors that possibly alter water availability and position, can have significant impacts on how the CZ-ecosystem functions.

An additional layer of complexity in ecohydrologic processes has been hinted at for decades and is emphasized in recent, explicitly CZ-focused work. In multiple ecosystems, rock water extraction by vegetation has been observed (Anderson et al. 1995; Sternberg et al. 1996; Bornyasz et al. 2005). More recently, neutron probe data from the mountainous western U.S. demonstrate a meaningful reliance of some vegetation on deep rock moisture – water retained in the weathered rock vadose zone (Rempe and Dietrich, 2018; McCormick et al. 2021). Given that rates of root growth into the subsurface can outpace rates of soil loss from erosion, roots thus not only influence water storage in these zones, but also govern the detachment of bedrock and the initiation of soil formation (Roering et al., 2010), factors that feedback to govern the generation of porosity and thus water storage. In the Anthropocene, rates of forest harvesting may be outpacing the rate at which root growth by trees impart their ability to fracture or detach bedrock in working forests (Roering et al., 2010).

The human influence in the Anthropocene is also evident via shifting rooting depth and/or rooting function at a diversity of scales. Given the role of roots as soil architects, human activities that modify root activities are likely altering the physical structure of the subsurface. Within a given biome, changes in environmental conditions that shift the amount and timing of plant water use (*e.g.*, via changes in plant water use efficiency, the depth to which water is extracted, or the frequency with which soils may undergo wetting and drying) may alter aggregate formation and stability, and thus soil structure (Degens and Sparling, 1995; Denef et al., 2001; Bronick and Lal, 2005; Cosentino et al., 2006; Park et al., 2007). Where permafrost thaws or alpine tundra warms, more deeply rooted, woody vegetation can develop (Wilmking et al., 2006). Woody encroachment of deeply-rooted shrubs into grasslands in warmer climates is also accelerating (Saintilan and Rogers, 2015). Globally, estimates suggest that an additional ~19,200 km³ of soil have become rooted in regions experiencing root deepening in the Anthropocene (Hauser et al., 2022; Figure 4). These root-deepening phenomena have the potential to sculpt the subsurface in ways that influence water flow through the subsurface (Sullivan et al., 2022). Root shallowing also is an important Anthropocene phenomenon; roots are absent from an estimated 30,100 km³ of soil today compared to soil volumes rooted by potential vegetation (Hauser et al., 2022). Roots have been removed from an estimated 13,700 km³ of this volume where perennial systems have been

replaced with annual agriculture, a landscape feature expected to expand in the future (Hauser et al., 2022; Figure 4).

The net effect of human activities in the Anthropocene thus has been a shallowing of roots, and a decline in the soil volume directly mined by roots for water and nutrients (Hauser et al., 2022). This feature prompts the question of how soil formation processes are transformed as root shallowing limits the production of weathering agents, particularly given the long time periods over which root regeneration occurs (Billings et al., 2018). More generally, this phenomenon highlights the fundamental role of an ecological consideration – rooting depth – as an agent of soil engineering at depth and thus of CZ functioning.

Ecophysiological considerations

The water uptake patterns permitted by local climate and physical landscape- and pedon-scale features, described above, are the scaled-up result of processes occurring at the momentary and cellular temporal and spatial scales, respectively. The dynamics of plant water uptake and loss are rapid. Indeed, while water accounts for up to 95% of the fresh weight of herbaceous plants, the majority of water absorbed by most plant species (~ 98%) is lost to the atmosphere via transpiration within minutes of being absorbed from the soil. Thus, plants need enormous amounts of water to offset transpiration losses and facilitate C uptake (and photosynthesis). While some species can absorb a significant portion of water through leaf pores (as dew or vapor) (Berkelhammer et al., 2013; Hill et al., 2021), the vast majority of plant species rely on root uptake to meet water demands. Roots provide several key functions for plants, including anchorage to the terrestrial surface, but the functional consequences of water and nutrient absorption from the soil are key determinants of nutrient, C, and water recycling within ecosystems and serve as a link between belowground and aboveground physiological processes (Jackson et al., 2000).

Plant roots absorb water from the soil based on the hydrostatic pressure gradients established from soil matric to leaf water potentials. Water flows down this potential energy gradient as long as the potential energy in the leaf that is established by water lost via transpiration is lower than that in the soil. As the soil dries, the potential energy gradient from soil to leaf declines, resulting in less plant-available water. In this situation, plants: (1) close leaf stomata to reduce the water potential gradient, (2) lower the leaf water potential (by increasing transpiration) to re-establish a larger pressure gradient from soil to leaf allowing for greater potential extraction of water from soil spaces, or (3) utilize water from potentially wetter zones of the soil. The degree of leaf stomatal control used to regulate transpiration flux has been commonly described as isohydric or anisohydric (Tardieu and Simonneau, 1998; McDowell et al., 2008). Isohydry refers to a strategy of stomatal regulation to maintain a constant water potential prior to wilting and prior to the establishment of air embolisms and cavitation in the xylem vasculature. Thus, isohydric strategies reduce transpiration to minimize the chance of wilting and hydraulic failure, but with a cost of reduced C assimilation and growth. Plant species that utilize anisohydric strategies regulate transpiration at the expense of potential hydraulic failure to maintain the hydrostatic pressure gradient as soils dry and water is less available. Thus, anisohydric species are able to maintain C assimilation but at greater risk of desiccation. Strategies of isohydry or anisohydry vary by species and genotypes according to changes in soil water availability, which in turn vary across catenas and landscapes (Figure 5). While these strategies present dichotomous endpoints of acclimation to low water availability, most plant species exhibit aspects of each, with examples of isohydric behavior during specific periods of growth or portions of a season and anisohydric behavior during others (Klein, 2014).

Root traits have long been examined to try to understand plant, and thus ecosystem, functions. The root trait most frequently reported as a predictor of ecosystem function has been maximum rooting depth, which has been reported for a diversity of species and varies with biogeography (Stone and Kalisz, 1991; Schenk and Jackson, 2002; Schenk and Jackson, 2005; Tumber-Dávila et al., 2022). However, if we want to improve our ability to predict how species coexist within ecosystems or how global environmental changes may impact communities in space and time, other characteristics of root systems beyond maximum rooting depth require consideration (Kong et al., 2014; Nippert and Holdo, 2015). For example, not all roots are created equal. Angiosperm species can be tap-rooted or fibrous, with branching tap-roots more common in eudicots, and dense fibrous root systems more common in monocots (Blair et al., 2013). Fibrous and tap-rooted species have inherently different morphologies, with different root densities within a given layer of the soil, varying depth distributions of roots, and varying root diameters within depth distributions of the soil (Jackson et al., 1996; McCormack et al., 2015). Species with tap roots tend to have roots of larger diameter, with a deeper maximum rooting depth but reduced fine root density at any particular depth compared to fibrous root systems (Jackson et al., 1996). Species with fibrous root systems tend to be more efficient at absorbing water, can typically resist lower water potentials (Craine et al., 2013), and have higher root turnover (lower longevity). Even within species (and genotypes), these root morphological traits have high variability (Chen et al., 2013; Kumordzi et al., 2019), highlighting the need for greater investigation of what drives this variability in root morphological traits.

In addition to differences in root system morphology, the functional attributes (i.e., physiology, including water absorption) of roots vary among species, locations, and temporal periods of the growing season. Using stable isotopes as natural tracers of resource uptake, plant scientists have discovered that root presence at a particular soil depth does not equate to water uptake (root function) from roots that exist within a particular depth (Dawson and Ehleringer, 1991; Nippert and Knapp, 2007; Case et al., 2020). This result implies that just because a plant species has roots within a particular zone of the soil it does not mean that water is being absorbed from that soil zone. Interestingly, this outcome has been documented for many plant species that have roots in portions of the soil profile with plant-available water. For many herbaceous species, deep roots typically contribute very little to the overall plant water budget despite roots being present at depth. It remains unclear why plants possessing roots in zones of the soil with available water may not use that reservoir. As previously described, water moves primarily by mass flow to roots and root hairs down a pressure potential gradient. Following absorption, water can move towards the vascular cylinder via apoplastic (between cells) and symplastic (from cell to cell across membranes) movement pathways. However, once water reaches the endodermis, only symplastic transport is possible across the Casparian Strip (CS) (Geldner, 2013). Plant biochemists still have a limited understanding of how water movement is regulated across the CS, but transport across this barrier can be turned on and off (Geldner, 2013; Barberon et al., 2016). Thus, vascular plants have the ability to regulate water transport through cellular mechanisms associated with transport across the endodermis. Finally, the microanatomical features of roots vary within an individual based on root order, depth in the soil, and phenological stage (Nippert et al., 2012). For herbaceous species, this typically means reduced hydraulic conductivity (and reduced rates of water transport) from deeper soil depths (Nippert et al., 2012; O’Keefe et al., 2021). To better understand how, when, and where root functionality occurs requires a greater understanding of the variability in root micro-anatomical features.

Microanatomy is a historically overlooked aspect of plant roots that links physiology and whole-root system morphology – and thus to CZ-ecosystem functioning. The microanatomical characteristics provide insights into the larger functional contexts of root systems. Root traits like the ratio of cortex to

stele, vessel size, vessel number, xylem wall thickness, and hydraulic conductance, all provide clues towards understanding the investment in safety vs. efficiency of water transport through root systems (Freschet et al., 2020). In the seminal work by Wahl and Ryser (2000), the authors used root microanatomical traits (*e.g.*, cross sectional area, number of xylem, xylem wall thickness) with aboveground processes like relative growth rate. This work illustrated tradeoffs in safety vs. efficiency of water transport in root microanatomy that predicted whole plant growth traits for perennial grasses (Wahl and Ryser, 2000). Based on these observations, subsequent studies have highlighted how the internal root structure sets a foundation for the whole root system function (Nippert et al., 2012, Wargowsky et al., 2021, O’Keefe et al., 2021). Relationships between root microanatomy and aboveground physiology / growth vary by within communities (O’Keefe et al., 2021), plant functional type (Wargowsky et al., 2021) and phylogeny (Valverde-Barrantes et al., 2021) and are an active topic of investigation. Because microanatomical images of roots require more preparation time than whole root systems, they have been utilized much less than other traits. For this reason, there is much remaining to discover with regard to linking the internal anatomy of roots to the broader water and nutrient uptake patterns of plant species and communities (Freschet et al., 2020).

As described so far, plant roots vary in both morphology (whole-plant and microanatomical) and physiology among plant types, species, and ecosystems, and the biological focus of this knowledge base is clear. Unsurprisingly, these root differences translate to variability in resource uptake, subsurface porosity, and weathering within the soil profile in space and time. For these reasons, inferring root functional processes (*e.g.*, water uptake) is rarely as intuitive as measuring maximum rooting depth, or root biomass and yet has great importance for projecting whole CZ-ecosystem functioning. Improving linkages between root physiology and CZ-ecosystem properties requires better measurements of root longevity, associating roots to species (in mixed-species environments), quantifying growth rates and biomass by depth through time, and linking these features to the dynamic physical and chemical properties of the soil. Resolving these biologically-focused frontiers in the context of the abiotic constraints on CZ hydrology will undoubtedly assist with linking root presence and activities with ecosystem modification, and further our understanding of how root structure and function regulate pools of water and nutrients and fluxes of water, C, and nutrients in the CZ (Brantley et al., 2017; Dawson et al., 2020). Specifically, such efforts are necessary for understanding how ecological processes feedback to CZ hydrologic functioning.

Roots and microbes as indirect biotic drivers of CZ hydrologic functioning

In addition to the direct effect of roots on water uptake throughout soil profiles and across landscapes, roots are active sculptors of the subsurface (Figure 6). As such, they represent key agents linking the biotic to the abiotic realms within a CZ. Roots have significant impacts on the depth to which water can infiltrate and the position of the water table. Specifically, roots promote flow. Macropores, acknowledged above as a soil constraint on hydrologic functioning, are often formed via root growth (Angers and Caron, 1998; Zhang et al., 2015; Lucas et al., 2019) and reinforced via deposition and accumulation of clay films (Sigen et al., 1997). After root shrinkage, saturated films on root surfaces or along pore walls provide evidence of flow in these pores (Bogner et al., 2010). Where roots persist at depth, development of preferential flow paths is thought to trigger a positive feedback by enhancing the water drainage to depth (D’Odorico et al., 2012; Viglizzo et al., 2015; Pawlik et al., 2016). Not only do roots generate pores, but their growth can both build and destroy soil aggregates through enmeshing small particles or cleaving apart big aggregates (Lu et al., 2020), a process that alters the size and distribution of macropores. Because roots control soil-hydraulic properties and the generation of preferential flow, small changes in rooting depth distributions can alter water flow significantly (Beven and Germann, 2013; Noguchi et al., 1997). Indeed, given that roots transform far more soil volume than

rhizosphere dimensions might initially suggest (Richter et al., 2007), extant aggregate size distributions and pore networks likely represent the legacy of past generations of roots.

Root growth also imparts an important impact on the translocation of clay minerals and clay-sized particles, a process that influences both soil water flows and storage. Though clay-rich horizons can develop as clay forms within the horizon, in many locations clay accumulates in a horizon with illuviation from upper horizons (Weil and Brady, 2017; Calabrese et al., 2018). The downward movement of clay-sized particles and clay minerals is linked to climate, occurring where effective precipitation is sufficient to promote downward movement of particles through the profile (Goddard et al., 1973; Honeycutt et al., 1990; Lawrence et al., 2021) and likely facilitated by seasonal wetting and drying. However, the downward transport of clay across horizons also is governed by the generation of flow paths through which clay illuviation can proceed (Rebertus and Buol, 1985). The resulting clay-rich horizons influence profile water dynamics via lower saturated hydraulic conductivity and thus enhanced water storage, and depth-dependent hydraulic conductivity due to the textural discontinuities with neighboring soil horizons (Richter and Markewitz, 2001; Figure 7). Clay-rich horizons also can result in a layer of soil difficult for roots to penetrate (Gao et al., 2016). In this indirect way, then, roots govern their own hydrologic environment.

Microbes, too, sculpt the soil. Soil microbes exude compounds that can serve as binding agents (Tisdall and Oades, 1982). The complex mix of exudation compounds (e.g., polysaccharides, organic acids, enzymes, diverse waste products, often referred to collectively as EPS (see above)) is composed of materials critical for soil aggregate formation and preservation (Jastrow et al., 1998). Microbial necromass is emerging as an important feature for aggregate formation and preservation. The remnants of dead soil microbes appear to persist in soil far longer than some plant-derived compounds (Liang et al., 2017), potentially serving as glue adhering mineral and organic particles together into aggregates (Buckeridge et al., 2021); the observation that microaggregates tend to harbor relatively old organic C (Romkens et al., 1998) suggests that smaller aggregates may retain microbial necromass to a greater extent than in larger aggregates. Thus, necromass and the exudates of living microbes govern soil void geometries by influencing soil aggregate formation and durability. Like all soil microbial activities, these processes are especially prevalent in and around the rhizosphere, but any such microbial actions whether in bulk or rhizosphere soil can be important for structural change.

Additional microbial actions further can drive soil structure. Soil microbes induce soil organic matter (SOM) decay via exo-enzymes, and transform some of the C into CO₂ and released nutrients and C into biomass. As SOM is transformed from a solid into a solute, and then into either a gaseous or microbial form, soil aggregates can collapse (Bronick and Lal, 2005). The fate of the non-decayed SOM that had resided within collapsed aggregates is unclear, though it is presumed that the removal of aggregate structural protection (Six and Paustian, 2014) means that any remaining SOM experiences a greater probability of undergoing decay. Whether aggregate collapse associated with SOM decay promotes a loss or a gain in soil porosity is a matter of some debate. Over broad spatial scales, higher concentrations of SOM generally correlate with greater porosity (Franzenluebbbers 2014). However, the transformation of a solid material into a gaseous or solute form results in the presence of small pores in the space where that solid material previously existed. The net effect of SOM mineralization within an aggregate on soil aggregate stability and size distribution is unclear, though some studies suggest that pore opening dominates (X. Zhang, P. Sullivan, S. Billings et al., unpublished data). Discerning the conditions under which SOM decay induces porosity gains or losses is a current research focus.

Another mechanism by which both soil microbes and roots can influence soil structure is via the exudation of organic acids and CO₂. Organic acids release nutrients from minerals (Aoki et al., 2012; Keiluweit et al., 2015; Lugli et al., 2019), often via ligand exchange (Ganor et al., 2009; Keiluweit et al., 2015; Hasegawa et al., 2015). Carbon dioxide, once dissolved into the carbonic acid system, can also induce acid-promoted rock and mineral transformations (*e.g.*, Keller, 2019). Acid transformations of rock are a key feature of long-term soil development (Brantley et al. 2012; Dontsova et al. 2020; Hauser et al. 2020). Indeed, over long timescales, such momentary-scale processes can enhance soil porosity in the regolith and bedrock itself, and ultimately promote soil production from rock. Thus, microbial and root acid losses can be important determinants of soil structure over diverse timescales.

Because roots and microbes influence soil structure, and because soil microbes tend to proliferate near roots, any change in rooting depth distributions has the potential to alter soil aggregate and void arrangement, and thus CZ functioning (Figure 2). Recent work highlighting the role of humans during the Anthropocene in regionally-dependent deepening or shallowing of roots indicates the massive scale at which these phenomena are occurring (Hauser et al., 2022). Ecosystem process models, reactive transport models, and continental-scale models of biosphere-atmosphere exchanges of energy and water offer the opportunity to test hypotheses probing the effects of modified abundances of deep root influences on soil structure (Sullivan et al., 2022). Modeling efforts like these will further strengthen the intellectual ties among ecosystem ecologists and the diversity of investigators working on CZ problems.

Conclusion

Understanding the CZ as an ecological problem and designing research that invokes the CZ paradigm offers us a way forward as we attempt to project future environmental processes in the Anthropocene. In this chapter, we provide examples of biotic-abiotic processes across a diversity of scales that govern CZ functioning and that are impossible to understand and predict without the use of the CZ paradigm. We specifically focus on hydrologic functioning given water's importance in both the biotic and abiotic realms.

By describing the influence of soil texture and macroporosity on hydrologic flow patterns, we highlight how fundamental CZ constraints (Field et al., 2014; here, the particle surface area present in a soil profile and the capacity of that soil to move water with relatively little tension) can govern the storage and fluxes of a critical resource – water. In turn, water fluxes through a soil profile influence the extent and pace of soil horizonization, which can result in varied capacity of soil at a given depth to store and release water (Figure 7). Roots also contribute to soil development in numerous ways (Figure 6), among them their capacity for perforating soil and thus generating pores through which fluids can flow. Of course, roots also drive water loss from soils. Combined, these actions – root growth and water uptake – promote movement of soil particles at small (~nm to cm) scales, further modifying the soil pore networks through which liquids and gases flow. Widespread changes in rooting depth in the Anthropocene (Figure 4) likely have modified pore networks in meaningful but unquantified ways. Microbes further contribute to these dynamics, in multiple ways. One salient role of soil microbes is their mineralization of soil organic C into CO₂. This mineralization removes a structural agent from the soil, and likely can induce the collapse of soil structural features that may protect soil organic matter from microbial attack (Figure 2). Microbes and roots also generate acids that impose structural change to the regolith and bedrock via rock and mineral transformations. These root and microbial actions, and associated flows of water and soil particles, only sometimes scale up in a predictable way. However, at a landscape scale, we can expect spatial variability in soil capacity to retain water (Figure 3) and plant adaptations to varied water availability (Figure 5) that reflect water's tendency to flow towards more negative water potentials. Scaling the flows of fluids and solids, and patterns of root water uptake and

soil microbial mineralization, across watersheds and landscapes remains a challenge important to address given spatially-varied responses of water availability to a changing climate. This challenge cannot be met without appreciating both the biotic and abiotic characteristics of the soil profile or landscape in question.

A multitude of biotic-abiotic interactions not addressed in this work but that govern CZ functioning also require a transdisciplinary, CZ approach to develop a predictive understanding of the processes at large. Consider, for example, how within-canopy air currents govern system energy and water dynamics throughout the CZ (Monson and Baldocchi, 2014; Bonan, 2016). Linkages among soil structural attributes and hydrologic flows and resulting soil C and nutrient pools and fluxes are well-established (Richter and Markewitz, 2001; Weil and Brady, 2017; Schlesinger and Bernhardt, 2020). Other examples of biotic-abiotic interactions include the generation of channels by soil fauna through which gases and solutes flow (Platt et al., 2016), and how SOM flows across landscapes with erosion (Dialynas et al., 2016; Berhe et al., 2018) result in a redistribution of this key agent of soil structure and a source of CO₂ and organically-bound nutrients (Billings et al., 2019). All of these processes participate in the complex interplay of the biota with the abiotic that structure the physical and chemical conditions in which life persists.

We emphasize that the biotic responses to land use, temperature, precipitation patterns, and atmospheric CO₂ concentrations – often explored in ecosystem ecology – can be rapid. Because biota influence soil structure, rapid responses of biota to environmental conditions may prompt rapid changes in the structure and function of the CZ, and thus impart meaningful alterations to CZ-climate feedbacks (Sullivan et al., 2022). It is no longer possible to examine these environmental puzzles effectively from the perspective of a single or even a pair of disciplines. The knowledge bases required to understand these processes emerge from a diversity of disciplines, including geomorphology, soil science, ecohydrology, plant physiology, and ecosystem ecology. It is no coincidence that biotic-abiotic interactions all revolve around soil; soil is where the lithosphere, biosphere, atmosphere, and hydrosphere interact to form Earth's living skin, and is perhaps the most intuitive location within the CZ where biotic and abiotic processes come to govern the functioning of the CZ ecosystem (Figure 1). Integrating knowledge from these realms has offered CZ scientists the opportunity to gain new insights about the functioning at Earth's surface, which in turn allows the community to project Earth's future functioning via both empirical and modeling studies. Taking our cues from the likes of Humboldt, Foote, Tansley, and Berner, we can continue to contribute to the rich history of the science of the CZ ecosystem, and move forward with greater confidence in our ability to project future CZ functioning.

Funding acknowledgements

The authors have been supported by National Science Foundation (NSF) grants 13331846 (SAB, DDR), 2026874 (PLS, SAB, DRH), 2034232 (PLS, SAB, DRH), 2012633 (SAB), 2012796 (PLS), 2025849 (JN), 2121694 (PLS, SAB, DRH, JN), and 2024388 (PLS, JN), and by the U.S. Department of Energy grant DE-SC0019037 (JN). This work was also supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture through Hatch funds (CA-R-ENS-5195-H, project accession no. 1022418, DRH) and a Signals in the Soil grant (2021-67019-34341 (DRH) and 2021-67019-34338 (SAB)). This material is also based on work supported by the NSF under OIA-1656006 with matching support from the State of Kansas through the Kansas Board of Regents (SAB and PLS).

References

- Aciego SM, Riebe CS, Hart SC et al (2017) Dust outpaces bedrock in nutrient supply to montane forest ecosystems. *Nat Comm* doi 10.1038/ncomms14800
- Anderson MA, Graham RC, Alyanakian GJ et al (1995) Late summer water status of soils and weathered bedrock in a giant sequoia grove. *Soil Sci* 160:415–422
- Angers DA, Caron J (1998) Plant-induced changes in soil structure: Processes and feedbacks. *Biogeochemistry* 42:55-72
- Aoki M, Fujii K, Kitayama K (2012) Environmental control of root exudation of low-molecular weight organic acids in tropical rainforests. *Ecosystems* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9575-6>
- Baldrian P (2019) The known and the unknown in soil microbial ecology. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 95:fiz005 doi 10.1093/femsec/fiz005
- Barberon M, Vermeer JEM, De Bellis D et al (2016) Adaptation of root function by nutrient-induced plasticity of endodermal differentiation. *Cell* 164:447-459
- Bennett JA, Klironomos J (2018) Mechanisms of plant-soil feedback: Interactions among biotic and abiotic drivers. *New Phytologist* 222:91-96
- Berhe AA, Barnes RT, Six J et al (2018) Role of soil erosion in biogeochemical cycling of essential elements: C, nitrogen, and phosphorus. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences* doi 10.1146/annurev-earth-082517
- Berkelhammer M, Hu J, Bailey A et al (2013) The nocturnal water cycle in an open-canopy forest. *J Geophys Res Atmos* 118:10225-10242 doi [10.1002/jgrd.50701](https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50701)
- Beven K, Germann P (1982) Macropores in water flow in soils. *Water Resources Research* 18:1311-1325
- Beven K, Germann P (2013) Macropores and water flow in soils revisited. *Water Resources Research* 49:3071-3092
- Bilir TE, Fung I, Dawson TE (2021) Slope-aspect induced climate differences influence how water is exchanged between the land and atmosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* doi 10.1029/2020JG006027
- Billings SA, Hirmas D, Sullivan PL et al (2018) Loss of deep roots limits biogenic agents of soil development that are only partially restored by decades of forest regeneration. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* 6:34 doi: 10.1525/elementa.287

- Billings SA, Richter DdeB, Ziegler SE et al (2019) Distinct contributions of eroding and depositional profiles to land-atmosphere CO₂ exchange in two contrasting forests. *Frontiers in Earth Science* 7 doi: 10.3389/feart.2019.00036
- Billings SA, Sullivan PL (2022) Working across scales to project soil biogeochemical responses to climate. In: Yang Y, Keiluweit M, Senesi N, Xing B eds. *Multi-Scale Biogeochemical Processes in Soil Ecosystems: Critical Reactions and Resilience to Climate Changes*, Vol. 5 in IUPAC Series on Biophysico-Chemical Processes in Environmental Systems, Wiley
- Black PE (1997) Watershed functions. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 33:1-11
- Bogner C, Gaul D, Kolb A et al (2010) Investigating flow mechanisms in a forest soil by mixed-effects modelling. *European Journal of Soil Science* 61:1079-1090
- Bonan GB (2016) Ecological climatology: Concepts and applications 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY
- Bormann FH, Likens GE (1967) Nutrient cycling: Small watersheds can provide invaluable information about terrestrial ecosystems. *Science* 155:424-429
- Bornyasz M, Graham R, Allen M (2005) Ectomycorrhizae in a soil-weathered granitic bedrock regolith: linking matrix resources to plants. *Geoderma* 126, 141–160
- Brantley SL, Eissenstat DM, Marshall JA et al (2017) Reviews and syntheses: on the roles trees play in building and plumbing the CZ. *Biogeosciences* 14:5115-5142
- Brantley S., Goldhaber M B, Ragnarsdottir K V (2007) Crossing disciplines and scales to understand the CZ. *Elements* 3:307–314
- Brantley, S. L., Lebedeva, M., & Hausrath, E. M. (2012). A geobiological view of weathering and erosion. *Fundamentals of Geobiology*, 205-227. doi: 10.1002/9781118280874.ch12
- Brantley SL, Megonigal JP, Scatena FN (2011) Twelve testable hypotheses on the geobiology of weathering. *Geobiology* 9:140-165
- Brecheisen ZS, Richter DD, Moon S et al (2021) Quantitative analysis of hillshed geomorphology and critical zone function: Raising the hillshed to watershed status. *GSA Bulletin* 134:2007-2021
- Bronick CJ, Lal R (2005) Soil structure and management: A review. *Geoderma* 124:3-22
- Buckeridge KM, Creamer C, Whitaker J (2021) Deconstructing the microbial necromass continuum to inform soil carbon sequestration. *Functional Ecology* doi 10.1111/1365-2435.14014
- Buckeridge KM, La Rosa AF, Mason KE et al (2020) Sticky dead microbes: Rapid abiotic retention of microbial necromass in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 149:107929

711 Buol SW, Southard RJ, Graham RC et al (2011) Soil genesis and classification. 6th ed. Wiley-Blackwell,
 712 Ames, IA
 713
 714 Calabrese S, Richter DD, Porporato A (2018) The formation of clay-enriched horizons by lessivage.
 715 *Geophysical Research Letters* doi 10.1029/2018GL078778
 716
 717 Caplan JS, Giménez D, Hirmas DR et al (2019) Decadal-scale shifts in soil hydraulic properties as induced
 718 by altered precipitation. *Science Advances* 5:eaau6635
 719
 720 Case MF, Nippert JB, Holdo RM et al (2020) Root-niche separation between savanna trees and grasses is
 721 greater on sandier soils. *Journal of Ecology* 108:2298-2308
 722
 723 Chadwick OA, Derry LA, Vitousek PM et al (1999) Changing sources of nutrients during four million years
 724 of ecosystem development. *Nature* 397:491-497
 725
 726 Chamberlin CA, Bianchi TS, Brown AL et al (2019) Mass balance implies Holocene development of a low-
 727 relief karst patterned landscape. *Chemical Geology* 527:118782
 728
 729 Chen W, Zeng H, Eissenstat DM et al (2013) Root trait variation and evolution. *Global Ecology and*
 730 *Biogeography* 22:846-856
 731
 732 Cosentino D, Chenu C, Le Bissonnais Y (2006) Aggregate stability and microbial community dynamics
 733 under drying-wetting cycles in a silt loam soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 38:2053-2062
 734
 735 Costa OYA, Raaijmakers JM, Kuramae EE (2018) Microbial extracellular polymeric substances: Ecological
 736 function and impact on soil aggregation. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 9:1636
 737
 738 Craine JM, Ocheltree TW, Nippert JB et al (2013) Global diversity of drought tolerance and grassland
 739 climate-change resilience. *Nature Climate Change* 3:63-67
 740
 741 Dawson TE, Ehleringer JR (1991) Streamside trees that do not use stream water. *Nature* 350:335-337
 742
 743 Dawson TE, Hahm WJ, Crutchfield-Peters K (2020) Digging deeper: What the CZ perspective adds to the
 744 study of plant ecophysiology. *New Phytologist* 226:666-671
 745
 746 Degens BP, Sparling GP (1995) Repeated wet-dry cycles do not accelerate the mineralization of organic C
 747 involved in the macro-aggregation of a sandy loam soil. *Plant and Soil* 175:197-203
 748
 749 Denef K, Six J, Bossuyt H et al (2001) Influence of dry-wet cycles on the interrelationship between
 750 aggregate, particulate organic matter, and microbial community dynamics. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*
 33:1599-1611
 751
 752 Derry LA, Chadwick OA (2007) Contributions from Earth's atmosphere to soil. *Elements* 3:333-338.
 753
 752 Dialynas YG, Bastola S, Bras RL et al (2016) Topographic variability and the influence of soil erosion on
 753 the C cycle. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 30 doi 10.1002/2015GB005302

754 D'Odorico P, Okin GS, Bestelmeyer BT (2012). A synthetic review of feedbacks and drivers of shrub
755 encroachment in arid grasslands. *Ecohydrology* 5:520-530

756 Dontsova K, Balogh-Brunstad Z, Chorover J (2020) Plants as drivers of rock weathering. In: Dontsova Z,
757 Balogh-Brunstad Z, Le Roux G (eds) *Biogeochemical Cycles* American Geophysical Union Geophysical
758 Monograph Series doi 10.1002/9781119413332.ch2

759

760 Dyck MF, Kachanoski RG (2010) Spatial scale-dependence of preferred flow domains during infiltration
761 in a layered field soil. *Vadose Zone Journal* 9:385-396

762

763 Eger A, Almond PC, Condron LM (2013) Phosphorus fertilization by active dust deposition in a super-
764 humid, temperate environment – Soil phosphorus fractionation and accession processes. *Global*
765 *Biogeochemical Cycles* 27:108-118

766

767 Fan Y, Clark M, Lawrence DM et al (2019) Hillslope hydrology in global change research and earth system
768 modeling. *Water Resources Research* 55 doi 10.1029/2018WR023903

769

770 Fan Y (2015) Groundwater in the Earth's CZ: Relevance to large-scale patterns and processes. *Water*
771 *Resources Research* 51:3052–3069

772

773 Fan Y, Miguez-Macho G, Jobbagy EG et al (2017) Hydrologic regulation of plant rooting depth.
774 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:10572-10577

775

776 Field JP, Breshears DD, Law DJ et al (2014) Critical zone services: Expanding context, constraints, and
777 currency beyond ecosystem services. *Vadose Zone Journal* doi 10.2136/vzj2014.10.0142

778

779 Foote E (1856) Circumstances affecting the heat of the sun's rays. *American Journal of Science and Arts*
780 22:382-383

781

782 Franzenleubbers AJ (2014) Stratification of soil porosity and organic matter. In: Glinski J, Horabik J, Lipiec
783 J (eds) *Encyclopedia of Agrophysics* doi 10.1007/978-481-3585-1_225

784

785 Freschet GT, Roumet C, Comas LH et al (2021) Root traits as drivers of plant and ecosystem functioning:
786 current understanding, pitfalls and future research needs. *New Phytologist* doi 10.1111/nph.17072

787

788 Gallardo A, Fernandez-Palacios JM, Bermudez A et al (2020) The pedogenic Walker and Syers model
789 under high atmospheric P deposition rates. *Biogeochemistry* 148:237-253

790

791 Gao W, Hodgkinson L, Jin K et al (2016) Deep roots and soil structure. *Plant, Cell and Environment*
792 39:1662-1668

793

794 Ganor J, Reznik IJ, Rosenberg YO (2009) Organics in waterrock interactions. *Rev Mineral Geochem*
795 70:259–369

796

797 Geldner N (2013) The endodermis. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 64:531-558.

798

799 Gilbert GK (1877) *Report on the Geology of the Henry Mountains. US Geographical and Geological*
800 *Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region*. Washington, DC: U.S. Gov. Print. Office.

Giménez D, Hirmas DR (2017) Macroporosity. In: Lal R (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Soil Science*, Vol. 2, 3rd Ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL

Harman C, Sivapalan M (2009) Effects of hydraulic conductivity variability on hillslope scale shallow subsurface flow response and storage discharge relations. *Water Resources Research* 45(1)

Hart MM, Cross AT, D'Agui HM et al (2020) Examining assumptions of soil microbial ecology in the monitoring of ecological restoration. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence* doi 10.1002/2688-8319.12031

Hasegawa S, MacDonald CA, Power SA (2015) Elevated carbon dioxide increases soil nitrogen and phosphorus availability in a phosphorus-limited Eucalyptus woodland. *Global Change Biology* 22:1628–1643

Hasenmueller EA, Gu X, Weitzman JN, Adams TS, Stinchcomb GE, Eissenstat DM, Drohan PJ, Brantley SL, Kaye JP (2017) Weathering of rock to regolith: the activity of deep roots in bedrock fractures. *Geoderma* 300:11–31

Hasenmueller EA, Jin L, Stinchcomb GE et al (2015) Topographic controls on the depth distribution of soil CO₂ in a small temperate watershed. *Applied Geochemistry* 63:58-69

Hauser E, Sullivan PL, Flores L et al (2021) Global-scale shifts in Anthropocene rooting depths pose unexamined consequences in critical zone functioning. In revision for *Earth's Future*.

Heimsath AM, Dietrich WE, Nishiizumi K et al (1997) The soil production function and landscape equilibrium. *Nature* 388: 358–361

Hill AJ, Dawson TE, Dody A (2021) Dew water-uptake pathways in Negev desert plants: a study using stable isotope tracers. *Oecologia* 196:353-361.

Hillel D (1998) Environmental soil physics. Academic Press, San Diego, CA

Hillel D (2003) Introduction to environmental soil physics. Elsevier, New York.

Hirmas DR, Giménez D, Nemes A et al (2018) Climate-induced changes in continental-scale soil macroporosity may intensify water cycle. *Nature* 561:100-103

Humphreys GS, Wilkinson MT (2007) The soil production function: A brief history and its rediscovery. *Geoderma* 139:73–78

Hutchinson GE. 1940. Bio-ecology by F. E. Clements and V. E. Shelford. *Review. Ecology* 21:267–268

Jackson R (2020) Eunice Foote, John Tyndall and a question of priority. *Notes and Records: The Royal Society Journal of the History of Science*. 74:105–118

Jackson RB, Canadell J, Ehleringer JR et al (1996) A global analysis of root distributions for terrestrial biomes. *Oecologia* 108:389-411

849 Jackson RB, Sperry JS, Dawson TE (2000) Root water uptake and transport: using physiological processes
850 in global predictions. *Trends in Plant Science* 5: 482-488
851

852 Jarvis N, Larsson M (2001) Modeling macropore flow in soils: Field validation and use for management
853 purposes. p. 189-215. In: National Research Council (ed.) *Conceptual models of flow and transport in the*
854 *fractured vadose zone*. National Academy Press, Washington, DC
855

856 Jastrow JD, Miller RM, Lussenhop J (1998) Contributions of interacting biological mechanisms to soil
857 aggregate stabilization in restored prairie. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 30:905-916
858

859 Jenny H (1946) Arrangement of soil series and types according to functions of soil-forming factors. *Soil*
860 *Science* 61:375-392
861

862 Johnson-Maynard JL, Strawn DG (2016) Linking physical and biogeochemical properties and processes in
863 the drilosphere. *Soil Science* 181:126-132
864

865 Jordan T, Ashley GM, Barton MD et al (2001) *Basic research opportunities in Earth science*. Washington,
866 DC, USA: National Academy Press
867

868 Jury WA, Horton R (2004) *Soil physics*. 6th ed. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ
869

870 Keiluweit M, Bourgoure JJ, Nico PS (2015) Mineral protection of soil carbon counteracted by root
871 exudates. *Nature Climate Change* 5:588–595
872

873 Keller K (2019) Carbon exports from terrestrial ecosystems: A critical-zone framework. *Ecosystems*
874 22:1691-1705
875

876 Klaus J, Jackson CR (2018) Interflow is not binary: A continuous shallow perched layer does not imply
877 continuous connectivity. *Water Resources Research* 54:5921-5932
878

879 Klein T (2014) The variability of stomatal sensitivity to leaf water potential across tree species indicates a
880 continuum between isohydric and anisohydric behaviours. *Functional Ecology* 28:1313-1320
881

882 Kong D, Ma C, Zhang Q et al (2014) Leading dimensions in absorptive root trait variation across 96
883 subtropical forest species. *New Phytologist* 203:863-872
884

885 Kumordzi BB, Aubin I, Cardou F, et al (2019) Geographic scale and disturbance influence intraspecific
886 trait variability in leaves and roots of North American understorey plants. *Functional Ecology* 33: 1771-
887 1784
888

889 Landeweert R, Hoffland E, Finlay RD et al (2001) Linking plants to rocks: ectomycorrhizal fungi mobilize
890 nutrients from minerals. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 16:248–254
891

892 Léonard J, Perrier E, Rajot JL (2004) Biological macropores effect on runoff and infiltration: A combined
893 experimental and modelling approach. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 104:277-285
894

895 Leone JD, Holbrook WS, Riebe CS et al (2020) Strong slope-aspect control of regolith thickness by
896 bedrock foliation. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 45:2998-3010

897
898 Liang C, Schimel JP, Jastrow JD (2017) The importance of anabolism in microbial control over soil C
899 storage. *Nature Microbiology* 2:17105 doi 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2017.105
900
901 Lin Y-C, Feng J-L (2015) Aeolian dust contribution to the formation of alpine soils at Amdo (Northern
902 Tibetan Plateau). *Geoderma* 259-260:104-115
903
904 Lovett GM (1994) Atmosphere deposition of nutrients and pollutants to North America: an
905 ecological perspective. *Ecological Applications* 4:629-650
906
907 Lovett GM, Cole JJ, Pace ML (2006) Is net ecosystem productivity equal to ecosystem carbon
908 accumulation? *Ecosystems* 9:1-4
909
910 Lu J, Zhang Q, Werner AD et al (2020) Root-induced changes of soil hydraulic properties—A
911 review. *Journal of Hydrology* 125203
912
913 Lucas M, Schlüter S, Vogel H-J et al (2019) Roots compact the surrounding soil depending on the
914 structures they encounter. *Scientific Reports* 9:16236 doi 10.1038/s41598-019-52665-w
915
916 Lugli L, Andersen KM, Aragao LEOC et al (2019) Multiple phosphorus acquisition strategies adopted by
917 fine roots in low-fertility soils in Central Amazonia. *Plant and Soil* doi 10.1007/s11104-019-03963-9
918
919 Maltz MR, Carey CJ, Freund HL et al (2022) Landscape topography and regional drought alters dust
920 microbiomes in the Sierra Nevada of California. *Frontiers in Microbiology* doi
921 10.3389/fmicb.2022.856454
922
923 Marcon V, Hoagland B, Gu X et al (2021) How the capacity of bedrock to collect dust and produce soil
924 affects phosphorus bioavailability in the northern Appalachian Mountains of Pennsylvania. *Earth Surface*
925 *Processes and Landforms* doi 10.1002/esp.5209
926
927 Markewitz D, Richter DD (1998) The *bio* in aluminum and silicon geochemistry. *Biogeochemistry* 42:235-
928 252
929
930 Marschner P, Rengel Z (2007) *Nutrient cycling in terrestrial ecosystems*. Springer, New York
931
932 McDowell N, Pockman WT, Allen CD et al (2008) Mechanisms of plant survival and mortality during
933 drought: why do some plants survive while others succumb to drought? *New Phytologist* 178:719-739
934
935 Milne G (1936) Normal erosion as a factor in soil profile development. *Nature* 138:548-549
936
937 McCormack ML, Dickie IA, Eissenstat DM et al (2015) Redefining fine roots improves understanding of
938 below-ground contributions to terrestrial biosphere processes. *New Phytologist* 207:505-518
939
940 McCormick EL, Dralle DN, Hahm WJ et al (2021) Widespread woody plant use of water stored in
941 bedrock. *Nature* 597:225-229
942
943 Molles MC, Sher AA (2019) *Ecology: Concepts and Applications*. McGraw Hill, New York
944

Monson R, Baldocchi D (2014) *Terrestrial biosphere-atmosphere fluxes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Morford SL, Houlton BZ, Dahlgren RA (2016) Geochemical and tectonic uplift controls on rock nitrogen inputs across terrestrial ecosystems. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 30 doi 10.1002/2015GB005283

Nimmo JR (2012) Preferential flow occurs in unsaturated conditions. *Hydrological Processes* 26:786-789

Nippert JB, Holdo RM (2015) Challenging the maximum rooting depth paradigm in grasslands and savannas. *Functional Ecology* 29:739-745

Nippert JB, Knapp AK (2007) Linking water uptake with rooting patterns in grassland species. *Oecologia* 153:261-272

Nippert JB, Wieme RA, Ocheltree TW et al (2012) Root characteristics of C 4 grasses limit reliance on deep soil water in tallgrass prairie. *Plant and Soil* 355:385-394

Noguchi S, Tsuboyama Y, Sidle RC et al (1997) Spatially distributed morphological characteristics of macropores in forest soils of Hitachi Ohta Experimental Watershed, Japan. *Journal of Forest Research*, 2:207-215

Odum EP (1968) Energy flow in ecosystems: a historical review. *American Zoologist* 8:11–18

O'Neill RV (2001) Is it time to bury the ecosystem concept? (with full military honors, of course!). *Ecology* 82:3275–3284

Park EJ, Sul WJ, Smucker AJM (2007) Glucose additions to aggregates subjected to drying/wetting cycles promote C sequestration and aggregate stability. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 39:2758-2768

Pataki DE, Ehleringer JR, Flanagan LB (2003) The application and interpretation of Keeling plots in terrestrial carbon cycle research. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 17:1022

Patton NR, Lohse KA, Godsey SE (2018) Predicting soil thickness on soil mantled hillslopes. *Nature Communications* 9:3329

Pawlik Ł (2013) The role of trees in the geomorphic system of forested hillslopes—a review. *Earth-Science Reviews* 126:250–265

Pawlik Ł, Phillips JD, Šamonil P (2016) Roots, rock, and regolith: Biomechanical and biochemical weathering by trees and its impact on hillslopes—A critical literature review. *Earth-Science Reviews* 159:142-159

Platt BF, Kolb DJ, Kunhardt CG et al (2016) Burrowing through the literature: The impact of soil-disturbing vertebrates on physical and chemical properties of soil. *Soil Science* 181:175-191

Radcliffe DE, Šimůnek J (2010) *Soil physics with HYDRUS: Modeling and applications*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL

993 Rempe DM, Dietrich WE (2018) Direct observations of rock moisture, a hidden component of the
 994 hydrologic cycle. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115:2664-2669
 995
 996 Richter DdeB, Billings SA (2015) 'One physical system': Tansley's ecosystem as Earth's critical zone. *New*
 997 *Phytologist* Tansley Review doi 10.1111/nph.13338
 998
 999 Richter DdeB, Billings SA (2020) Ansichten der Calzone: Views of the Calhoun Critical Zone Observatory.
 1000 In: Latour B, Weibel P (eds) *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. MIT Press,
 1001 Cambridge, MA
 1002
 1003 Richter DD, Billings SA, Groffman PM (2018a) Ideas and perspectives: Strengthening the biogeosciences
 1004 in environmental research networks. *Biogeosciences* 15:4815-4832
 1005
 1006 Richter DdeB, Eppes M-C, Austin JC (2020) Soil production and the soil geomorphology legacy of Grove
 1007 Karl Gilbert. *Soil Society of America Journal* doi 10.2136/sssaj2019.01.0021
 1008
 1009 Richter DD, Markewitz D (2001) *Understanding Soil Change: Soil Sustainability over Millennia, Centuries,*
 1010 *and Decades*. Cambridge University Press, New York
 1011
 1012 Richter DD, Oh NH, Fimmen R et al (2007) The rhizosphere and soil formation. pp. 179-200 In: Whitbeck
 1013 JL, Cardon ZG (eds.) *The Rhizosphere*. Academic Press, NY
 1014
 1015 Rillig MC, Mummey DL (2006) Mycorrhizas and soil structure. *New Phytologist* 171:41-53
 1016
 1017 Roebroek CTJ, Melsen LA, Hoek van Dijke AJ et al (2020) Global distribution of hydrologic controls on
 1018 forest growth. *Hydrology and Earth System Science* 24:4625-4639
 1019
 1020 Roering J, Marshall J, Booth AM et al (2010) Evidence for biotic controls on topography and soil
 1021 production. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 298:183-190
 1022
 1023 Romkens PFAM, Hassink J, van der Plicht J (1998) Soil organic ¹⁴C dynamics: Effects of pasture
 1024 installation on arable land. *Radiocarbon* 40:1023-1031
 1025
 1026 Saintilan N, Rogers K (2015) Woody plant encroachment of grasslands: a comparison of terrestrial and
 1027 wetland settings. *New Phytologist* 205:1062-1070
 1028
 1029 Schaetzl RJ, Anderson S (2005) *Soils: Genesis and geomorphology*. Cambridge University Press,
 1030 Cambridge, UK
 1031
 1032 Schaffer S (2020) Beware of precursors: How not to trace the history of the critical zone. In: Latour B,
 1033 Weibel P (eds.) *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. ZKM Karlsruhe, Germany,
 1034 and MIT Press, Cambridge, USA
 1035
 1036 Schenk HJ, Jackson RB (2002) The global biogeography of roots. *Ecological Monographs* 72: 311-328
 1037
 1038 Schenk HJ, Jackson RB (2005) Mapping the global distribution of deep roots in relation to climate and
 1039 soil characteristics. *Geoderma* 126:129-140
 1040

Schenk HJ, Jackson RB, (2002) Rooting depths, lateral root spreads and below-ground/above-ground allometries of plants in water-limited ecosystems. *Journal of Ecology* 90:480-494

Schlesinger W, Bernhardt E (2020) *Biogeochemistry: An Analysis of Global Change*. 4th ed. Academic Press, New York

Sher A, Molles M (2022) *Ecology: Concepts and Applications*. McGraw Hill, New York

Sigen C, Franklin RE, Johnson AD (1997) Clay film effects on ion transport in soil. *Soil Science* 162:91-96

Six J, Paustian K (2014) Aggregate-associated soil organic matter as an ecosystem property and a measurement tool. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 68:A4-A9

Smettem KRJ, Chittleborough DJ, Richards BG et al (1991) The influence of macropores on runoff generation from a hillslope soil with a contrasting textural class. *Journal of Hydrology* 122:235-252

Soderberg K, Compton JS (2007) Dust as a nutrient source for fynbos ecosystems, South Africa. *Ecosystems* 10, 550-561

Sorenson R (2011) Eunice Foote's pioneering research on CO₂ and climate warming. *Search and Discovery (70092)*. Retrieved 26 September 2022.

Sternberg P, Anderson M, Graham R et al (1996) Root distribution and seasonal water status in weathered granitic bedrock under chaparral. *Geoderma* 72:89-98

Stone EL, Kalisz PJ (1991) On the maximum extent of tree roots. *Forest Ecology and Management* 46:59-102

Stoops G (2003) *Guidelines for the analysis and description of soil and regolith thin sections*. 2nd Ed. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI

Sullivan PL, Billings S, Hirmas D et al. (2022) Embracing the dynamic nature of soil structure: A key paradigm shift for illuminating the role of life in the critical zones of the Anthropocene. *Earth-Science Reviews* 225:103873.

Sullivan PL, Price RM, Ross MS et al (2011) Hydrologic processes on tree islands in the Everglades (Florida, USA): tracking the effects of tree establishment and growth. *Hydrogeology Journal* 19:367-378

Sullivan PL, Price RM, Ross MS et al (2016) Trees: a powerful geomorphic agent governing the landscape evolution of a subtropical wetland. *Biogeochemistry* 128:369-384

Tansley AG. (1935) The use and abuse of vegetational concepts and terms. *Ecology* 16:284-307

Tardieu F, Simonneau T (1998) Variability among species of stomatal control under fluctuating soil water status and evaporative demand: modelling isohydric and anisohydric behaviours. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 49:419-432

1088 Thoma SG, Gallegos DP, Smith DM (1992) Impact of fracture coatings on fracture/matrix flow
1089 interactions in unsaturated, porous media. *Water Resources Research* 28:1357-1367
1090

1091 Tisdall JM, Oades JM (1982) Organic matter and water-stable aggregates in soils. *Journal of Soil Science*
1092 33: 141-163
1093

1094 Tumber-Dávila SJ, Schenk HJ, Du E et al (2022) Plant sizes and shapes above and belowground and their
1095 interactions with climate. *New Phytologist* 235:1032-1056
1096

1097 Turk JK, Chadwick OA, Graham RC (2012) Pedogenic processes. p. 30-1–30-29. In: Huang PM et al (eds.)
1098 *Handbook of soil sciences: Properties and processes*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL
1099

1100 Tyndall J (1861) The Bakerian Lecture: on the absorption and radiation of heat by gases and vapours,
1101 and on the physical connexion of radiation, absorption, and conduction. *Philosophical Transactions of*
1102 *the Royal Society* 151: 28–9
1103

1104 Uhlig D, Schuessler JA, Bouchez J et al (2017) Quantifying nutrient uptake as a driver of rock weathering
1105 in forest ecosystems by magnesium stable isotopes. *Biogeosciences* 14:3111-3128
1106

1107 Valverde-Barrantes OJ, Authier L, Schimann H et al (2021) Root anatomy helps to reconcile observed
1108 root trait syndromes in tropical tree species. *American Journal of Botany* 108:744–755
1109

1110 Viglizzo EF, Noretto MD, Jobbágy EG et al (2015) The ecohydrology of ecosystem transitions: a meta-
1111 analysis. *Ecohydrology* 8:911-921
1112

1113 Vogel C, Helfenstein J, Massey MS et al (2021) Microspectroscopy reveals dust-derived apatite grains in
1114 acidic, highly-weathered Hawaiian soils. *Geoderma* 381:114681
1115

1116 Wagener T, Sivapalan M, Troch P et al (2007) Catchment classification and hydrologic similarity.
1117 *Geography Compass* 1:901-931
1118

1119 Wahl S, Ryser P (2000) Root tissue structure is linked to ecological strategies of grasses. *New*
1120 *Phytologist* 148:459-471
1121

1122 Wargowsky IK, NeSmith JE, Holdo RM (2021) Root vascular traits differ systematically between African
1123 savanna tree and grass species, with implications for water use. *American Journal of Botany* 108:83-90
1124

1125 Watson P (2017) *Convergence: The Idea at the Heart of Science*. Simon and Schuster, New York
1126

1127 Watson KW, Luxmoore RJ (1986) Estimating macroporosity in a forest watershed by use of a tension
1128 infiltrometer. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 50:578-582
1129

1130 Weil RR, Brady NC (2017) *The Nature and Properties of Soils*. 15th Ed Pearson Publishing, Boston, MA
1131

1132 Wen H, Sullivan PL, Billings SA, Ajami H, Cueva A, Flores A et al. (2022) From soils to streams: Connecting
1133 terrestrial carbon transformation, chemical weathering, and solute export across hydrological regimes.
1134 *Water Resources Research* 58, e2022WR032314
1135

1136 Wigmosta MS, Vail LW, Lettenmaier DP (1994) A distributed hydrology-vegetation model for complex
 1137 terrain. *Water Resources Research* 30:1665-1679
 1138
 1139 Williamson TN, Gessler PN, Shouse PJ et al (2006) Pedogeneis-terrain links in zero-order watersheds
 1140 after chaparral to grass vegetation conversion. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70:2065-2074
 1141
 1142 Wilmking M, Harden J, Tape K (2006) Effect of tree line advance on C storage in NW Alaska. *Journal of*
 1143 *Geophysical Research* 111:G02023 doi 10.1029/2005JG000074
 1144
 1145 Wlostowski AN, Molotch N, Anderson SP et al (2020) Signatures of hydrologic function across the CZ
 1146 Observatory network. *Water Resources Research* 57:e2019WR026635
 1147
 1148 Wysocki DA, Schoeneberger PJ, Hirmas DR et al (2012) Geomorphology of soil landscapes. pp. 29-1–29-
 1149 26. In: Huang PM et al (eds.) *Handbook of soil sciences: Properties and processes*. CRC Press, Boca Raton,
 1150 FL

 1151 Yu H, Chin M, Yuan T et al (2015) The fertilizing role of African dust in the Amazon rainforest: A first
 1152 multiyear assessment based on data from Cloud-Aerosols Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite
 1153 Observations. *Geophysical Research Letters* 42:1984-1991

 1154 Yudina A, Kuzyakov Y (2019) Saving the face of soil aggregates. *Global Change Biology* 25:3574-3577

 1155 Zhang Y, Niu J, Yu X et al (2015) Effects of fine root length density and root biomass on soil preferential
 1156 flow in forest ecosystems. *Forest Systems* 24 doi 10.5424/fs/2015241-06048