

# 1    **Calculation of fungal and bacterial inorganic nitrogen immobilization rates in** 2    **soil**

3    Xiaobo Li<sup>1,2</sup>, Hongbo He<sup>3</sup>, Xudong Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Caner Kazanci<sup>4,5</sup>, Zhian Li<sup>1,2</sup>, Magdalena  
4    Necpalova<sup>6</sup>, Qianqian Ma<sup>1,2\*</sup>

5

6    <sup>1</sup> *Key Laboratory of Vegetation Restoration and Management of Degraded*  
7    *Ecosystems, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences,*  
8    *Guangzhou 510650, China.*

9    <sup>2</sup> *Center of Plant Ecology, Core Botanical Gardens, Chinese Academy of Sciences,*  
10    *Guangzhou 510650, China.*

11    <sup>3</sup> *Institute of Applied Ecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shenyang 110016,*  
12    *China.*

13    <sup>4</sup> *Department of Mathematics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA.*

14    <sup>5</sup> *College of Engineering, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA*

15    <sup>6</sup> *School of Agriculture and Food Science, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin*  
16    *4, Ireland.*

17

18    \*Corresponding author:

19    Q, Ma, South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guangzhou  
20    510650, China. *E-mail:* maqianqian@scbg.ac.cn

21

## 22    **Abstract**

23    Microbial inorganic nitrogen (N) immobilization is an important mechanism in the  
 24    retention of N in soils. However, as a result of the high diversity and complexity of  
 25    soil microorganisms, there is still no effective approach to measuring the respective  
 26    immobilization rates of inorganic N by fungi and bacteria, which are the two  
 27    dominant microbial communities in soils. We propose a mathematical framework,  
 28    combining the experimentally measurable gross inorganic N immobilization rate and  
 29    proxies for fungal and bacterial inorganic N immobilization rates, to quantify the  
 30    respective immobilization rates of inorganic N by fungal and bacterial communities in  
 31    soil. Our approach will help to unravel the mechanisms of N retention in soils.

## 32    **Keywords:**

33    Amino sugars; fungi; bacteria; microbial inorganic N immobilization; <sup>15</sup>N; stable  
 34    isotope probing

35

36    The microbial immobilization of inorganic nitrogen (N) has a vital role in controlling  
 37    the size of the soil inorganic N pool and is therefore an important mechanism for the  
 38    retention of N in ecosystems (Davidson et al 1992, Stark and Hart 1997, Zhang et al  
 39    2013, Zogg et al 2000). Through this immobilization process, inorganic N in soil is  
 40    converted to microbial biomass N and subsequently re-mineralized or converted to  
 41    stable organic N, eventually reducing the risk of N losses from soil (Recous et al 1990,  
 42    Tahovská et al 2013, Zhang et al 2019). As the dominant microorganisms in soil,

43 fungi and bacteria are probably the main participants in inorganic N immobilization  
 44 (Bottomley et al 2012, Boyle et al 2008, Myrold and Posavatz 2007). Given the  
 45 distinct physiologies, morphologies, lifestyles and quantities of these two microbial  
 46 groups in soil (Lauber et al 2008, Rousk and Bååth 2011, Six et al 2006, Waring et al  
 47 2013), the relative importance of fungi and bacteria in soil inorganic N  
 48 immobilization is likely to be unequal (Bottomley et al 2012, Li et al 2019, Myrold  
 49 and Posavatz 2007). However, as a result of the high diversity and complexity of soil  
 50 microorganisms, quantifying the respective rates of immobilization of inorganic N by  
 51 fungal and bacterial communities in soil is challenging (Fierer 2017, Li et al 2019, Li  
 52 et al 2020), although the gross inorganic N immobilization rate can be measured using  
 53 well-established  $^{15}\text{N}$  isotope techniques (e.g., the  $^{15}\text{N}$  pool dilution method) (Cheng  
 54 et al 2017, Murphy et al 2003).

55 Amino sugars, which are important constituents of microbial cell walls, have different  
 56 origins in microorganisms. Among the amino sugars identified in microorganisms,  
 57 muramic acid (MurN) originates exclusively from bacterial peptidoglycan, whereas  
 58 glucosamine (GlcN) is mainly in the form of chitin in fungal cell walls (Amelung  
 59 2001, Parsons 1981, Zhang and Amelung 1996). Based on their microbial source  
 60 specificity, stable isotope probing based on amino sugars ( $^{15}\text{N}$ -AS-SIP) has been  
 61 developed to disentangle the immobilization processes of inorganic N by fungi and  
 62 bacteria in soils (He et al 2006, He et al 2011a, He et al 2011b, Liang and Balser 2010,  
 63 Reay et al 2019a, Reay et al 2019b).

64 This approach has now been extended to indicate the inorganic N immobilization

65 rates of fungal and bacterial communities in soils (Li et al 2019, Li et al 2020). More  
66 specifically, given the relatively long persistence of amino sugars in soils (mean  
67 turnover time >2 years, much longer than that of the living microorganisms) (Derrien  
68 and Amelung 2011, Glaser et al 2006, Liu et al 2016), the newly formed <sup>15</sup>N-labeled  
69 amino sugars are considered to be stable in soil even after cell death (Glaser et al 2004,  
70 Gunina et al 2017). The fungal-derived <sup>15</sup>N-GlcN and bacterial-derived <sup>15</sup>N-MurN  
71 synthesis rates within a short period of incubation after <sup>15</sup>N tracer addition have  
72 therefore been used as proxies for the rates of immobilization of inorganic N by fungi  
73 and bacteria, respectively (Li et al 2019, Li et al 2020). However, mainly as a result of  
74 the variation in the composition of tissues of massive microbial species, but also  
75 within each species under different growth conditions, the actual contents of GlcN  
76 and MurN in the respective biomasses of fungi and bacteria in soil are almost  
77 unobtainable (Appuhn and Joergensen 2006, Engelking et al 2007, Glaser et al 2004,  
78 Joergensen 2018). It is also still unclear how fast do the cell N-containing components  
79 turn over intracellularly and extracellularly in soil (Dippold et al 2019, Engelking et al  
80 2007, Gunina et al 2017). As a consequence, converting the synthesis rates of  
81 <sup>15</sup>N-labeled amino sugars specific for fungi and bacteria to the actual inorganic N  
82 immobilization rates in soil is challenging.

83 To bypass this intractable problem, we propose a mathematical framework to estimate  
84 the conversion coefficients between fungal and bacterial inorganic N immobilization  
85 rates and their respective proxies by combining the gross inorganic N immobilization  
86 rate with proxies for the respective inorganic N immobilization rates of fungi and

87 bacteria. In this way, we can obtain the respective immobilization rates of inorganic N  
88 by fungal and bacterial communities in soil.

## 89 **Calculation of fungal and bacterial inorganic N immobilization rates**

90 Our proposed calculation is based on the assumption that fungi and bacteria are the  
91 dominant participants in soil microbial inorganic N immobilization. If both the gross  
92 inorganic N immobilization rate and the proxies for inorganic N immobilization rates  
93 of fungi and bacteria have been measured on  $n$  soil samples ( $n \geq 2$ ), then the respective  
94 immobilization rates of inorganic N by fungal and bacterial communities can be  
95 calculated.

96 The measured variables are:

97  $G = \begin{bmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \\ \vdots \\ G_n \end{bmatrix}$ : gross microbial inorganic N immobilization rates for  $n$  samples (mg N  
98  $\text{kg}^{-1} \text{day}^{-1}$ );

99  $F = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \\ \vdots \\ F_n \end{bmatrix}$ : fungal-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -GlcN synthesis rates for  $n$  samples (mg N  $\text{kg}^{-1} \text{day}^{-1}$ );

100  $B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ \vdots \\ B_n \end{bmatrix}$ : bacterial-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -MurN synthesis rates for  $n$  samples (mg N  $\text{kg}^{-1}$   
101  $\text{day}^{-1}$ ).

102 The two parameters to be estimated are:

103  $K_F$ : the conversion coefficient from the fungal-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -GlcN synthesis rate to the  
104 fungal inorganic N immobilization rate;

105  $K_B$ : the conversion coefficient from the bacterial-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -MurN synthesis rate to  
106 the bacterial inorganic N immobilization rate.

107 Using the  $^{15}\text{N}$ -labeled amino sugars synthesis rates and conversion coefficients, the  
108 estimated fungal and bacterial inorganic N immobilization rates ( $\text{mg N kg}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) are,  
109 respectively, calculated as:

$$110 \quad R_F = K_F \times F \quad (1)$$

111 and

$$112 \quad R_B = K_B \times B \quad (2)$$

113 Their sum is therefore the estimated gross microbial inorganic N immobilization rate  
114 ( $\text{mg N kg}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ):

$$\hat{G} = R_F + R_B = K_F \times F + K_B \times B$$

115 The measured gross microbial inorganic N immobilization rate results are included in  
116 the equation:

$$G = \hat{G} + e = K_F \times F + K_B \times B + e$$

117 where  $e$  is the estimation error. This equation can be rewritten in a matrix format:

$$G = [F \quad B] \begin{bmatrix} K_F \\ K_B \end{bmatrix} + e$$

118 Alternatively,

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \\ \vdots \\ G_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & B_1 \\ F_2 & B_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ F_n & B_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_F \\ K_B \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \\ \vdots \\ e_n \end{bmatrix}$$

119

120 If we let  $K = \begin{bmatrix} K_F \\ K_B \end{bmatrix}$  and  $X = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & B_1 \\ F_2 & B_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ F_n & B_n \end{bmatrix}$ , we obtain:

$$G = X K + e$$

121 The least-squares estimators that minimize the sum of the squared residuals are given  
122 in the following (see Appendix for the detailed derivation) (Wackerly et al 2014):

$$123 \quad \hat{K} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T G \quad (3)$$

124 To illustrate how this approach works, we calculated the soil nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ )  
125 immobilization rates of fungi and bacteria using the gross  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates  
126 reported by Zhang et al (2013) and the  $^{15}\text{N}$ -labeled amino sugars synthesis rates  
127 reported by Li et al (2019). Both studies studied the effect of land conversion from  
128 forest to agriculture on the soil  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization in subtropical zones of China.  
129 Ideally, the gross  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates and the  $^{15}\text{N}$ -labeled amino sugars  
130 synthesis rates should be measured under the same experimental conditions such as  
131 sampling sites. Due to the unavailability of such data, we roughly treat selected  
132 studies as being conducted at the same sites. Therefore, the results in Table 1 are  
133 presented as an illustrative example, rather than as reliable estimates. For simplicity,  
134 only the mean rates for forest and agricultural lands were used in this example ( $n = 2$ ).  
135 The conversion coefficients were obtained by substituting the measured gross  $\text{NO}_3^-$   
136 immobilization rates and the  $^{15}\text{N}$ -labeled amino sugars synthesis rates into Equation  
137 (3). The fungal and bacterial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates were then calculated using  
138 Equations (1) and (2). A summary of measured data and estimated values is provided  
139 in Table 1.

140 The results showed that the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates of fungi in woodland and  
141 agricultural soils were about 8.4 and four times those of bacteria, indicating that fungi

dominated the microbial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization in the studied soil (Table 1). Conversion to agricultural use led to decreases in the fungal and bacterial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates of 0.34 and 0.03  $\text{mg N kg}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ , respectively, which suggests that the decrease in the fungal  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rate dominates the decrease in the gross soil microbial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization caused by the land use change.

**Table 1.** An illustration of the method of calculating soil fungal and bacterial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates under different land use scenarios. The gross  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates ( $G$ ) were obtained from Zhang et al (2013). The synthesis rates of fungal-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -GlcN ( $F$ ) and bacterial-derived  $^{15}\text{N}$ -MurN ( $B$ ) were obtained from Li et al (2019) (see Table S1 for detailed calculations). These values are presented as an illustrative example, rather than as reliable estimates.

Land use	$G$	$F$	$B$	$K_F$	$K_B$	$R_F$	$R_B$
	$\text{mg N kg}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$					$\text{mg N kg}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$	
Woodland	0.47	0.0303	0.0022	13.78	23.83	0.42	0.05
Agriculture	0.10	0.0057	0.0009	13.78	23.83	0.08	0.02

Note:  $K_F$  and  $K_B$  are the conversion coefficients between  $F$ ,  $B$  and the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  immobilization rates of fungi ( $R_F$ ) and bacteria ( $R_B$ ), respectively.

# Advantages and limitations of this approach

Understanding the microbially mediated N cycling processes in soil is central to



158 unraveling soil N retention mechanisms and has ramifications for reducing N losses  
159 and managing ecosystem productivity. As a result of the high diversity and  
160 complexity of microbial communities, quantifying the process rates of different  
161 microbial groups has been a great challenge, especially in soil (Bardgett and Van Der  
162 Putten 2014, Fierer 2017, Stres and Tiedje 2006). Our approach provides an effective  
163 way to mathematically, rather than mechanically, quantify the relative importance of  
164 fungal and bacterial communities in soil inorganic N immobilization. It circumvents  
165 the bottleneck of directly measuring or estimating the inorganic N immobilization  
166 rates of fungi and bacteria in soil. The experimentally accessible gross inorganic N  
167 immobilization rate and proxies of fungal and bacterial inorganic N immobilization  
168 rates are used to estimate the conversion coefficients between fungal and bacterial  
169 inorganic N immobilization rates and their respective proxies. The conversion  
170 coefficients obtained inherently take into account both the actual contents of GlcN  
171 and MurN in the respective biomasses of fungi and bacteria and the turnover of cell  
172 N-containing components in the studied soil. Because the rationale and mathematical  
173 derivation are universal, our method may also be applicable to other environmental  
174 systems, such as freshly colonized organic substrates (Appuhn and Joergensen 2006).  
175 This approach relies on the simplifying assumption that only fungi and bacteria are  
176 involved in soil microbial inorganic N immobilization. This assumption may not quite  
177 hold true, because Archaea may also contribute to inorganic N immobilization  
178 (Laughlin et al 2009). Considering that Archaea contain GlcN, but not MurN  
179 (Joergensen 2018), the contribution of Archaea, if any, is included in the fungal

180 inorganic N immobilization rates by adopting our approach. Nevertheless, considering  
181 that Archaea account for less than <1% of the soil microbial biomass (Fierer 2017),  
182 the errors caused by this assumption are probably trivial.

## 183 **Conclusions**

184 We propose a mathematical approach that combines the mechanically accessible gross  
185 inorganic N immobilization rate and proxies for fungal and bacterial inorganic N  
186 immobilization rates (measured by <sup>15</sup>N-AS-SIP) to quantify the inorganic N  
187 immobilization rates of fungal and bacterial communities in soil. This approach,  
188 although not without its limitations, allows us for the first time to disentangle the  
189 actual contribution of fungi and bacteria to the immobilization of N-containing  
190 substrates in soil. Promisingly, integrating both fungal and bacterial inorganic N  
191 immobilization rates into terrestrial ecosystem models (e.g., microbial models) will  
192 improve our ability to understand, predict and manage the N retention capacity in  
193 soils under different scenarios (Waring et al 2013).

## 194 **Acknowledgments**

195 This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China  
196 (41977097, 41401279, 31600392 and 41630862), the Natural Science Foundation of  
197 Guangdong Province (2019A1515012067 and 2016A030310013), R & D program of  
198 Guangdong Provincial Department of Science and Technology (2018B030324003),  
199 China Soil Microbiome Initiative of the Chinese Academy of Sciences

(XDB15040200), the Research Fund of State Key Laboratory of Soil and Sustainable Agriculture, Nanjing Institute of Soil Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences (Y412201422), and National Key Research and Development Program of China (2017YFC0506305). H. He and X. Zhang acknowledge the CAS Interdisciplinary Innovation Team. X. Li appreciates China Scholarship Council for providing funds to support his study in Switzerland.

## References

- Amelung W (2001). Methods using amino sugars as markers for microbial residues in soil. *Assessment methods for soil carbon*. Lewis Publishers Boca Raton. pp 233-272.
- Appuhn A, Joergensen RG (2006). Microbial colonisation of roots as a function of plant species. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **38**: 1040-1051.
- Bardgett RD, Van Der Putten WH (2014). Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Nature* **515**: 505-511.
- Bottomley PJ, Taylor AE, Myrold DD (2012). A consideration of the relative contributions of different microbial subpopulations to the soil N cycle. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **3**: 373.
- Boyle SA, Yarwood RR, Bottomley PJ, Myrold DD (2008). Bacterial and fungal contributions to soil nitrogen cycling under Douglas fir and red alder at two sites in Oregon. *Soil Biology and*

221 *Biochemistry***40**: 443-451.

222

223 Cheng Y, Wang J, Wang J, Chang SX, Wang S (2017). The quality and quantity of exogenous  
224 organic carbon input control microbial NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> immobilization: A meta-analysis. *Soil Biology and*

225 *Biochemistry***115**: 357-363.

226

227 Davidson EA, Hart SC, Firestone MK (1992). Internal cycling of nitrate in soils of a mature  
228 coniferous forest. *Ecology***73**: 1148-1156.

229

230 Derrien D, Amelung W (2011). Computing the mean residence time of soil carbon fractions  
231 using stable isotopes: impacts of the model framework. *Eur J Soil Sci***62**: 237-252.

232

233 Dippold MA, Gunina A, Apostel C, Boesel S, Glaser B, Kuzyakov Y (2019). Metabolic tracing  
234 unravels pathways of fungal and bacterial amino sugar formation in soil. *Eur J Soil Sci***70**:  
235 421-430.

236

237 Engelking B, Flessa H, Joergensen RG (2007). Shifts in amino sugar and ergosterol contents  
238 after addition of sucrose and cellulose to soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry***39**: 2111-2118.

239

240 Fierer N (2017). Embracing the unknown: disentangling the complexities of the soil  
241 microbiome. *Nature Reviews Microbiology***15**: 579.

242

243 Glaser B, Turrión Ma-B, Alef K (2004). Amino sugars and muramic acid—biomarkers for soil  
244 microbial community structure analysis. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **36**: 399-407.  
245  
246 Glaser B, Millar N, Blum H (2006). Sequestration and turnover of bacterial- and fungal-derived  
247 carbon in a temperate grassland soil under long-term elevated atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub>. *Global*  
248 *Change Biology* **12**: 1521-1531.  
249  
250 Gunina A, Dippold M, Glaser B, Kuzyakov Y (2017). Turnover of microbial groups and cell  
251 components in soil: <sup>13</sup>C analysis of cellular biomarkers. *Biogeosciences* **14**: 271-283.  
252  
253 He H, Xie H, Zhang X (2006). A novel GC/MS technique to assess <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>C incorporation  
254 into soil amino sugars. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **38**: 1083-1091.  
255  
256 He H, Li X, Zhang W, Zhang X (2011a). Differentiating the dynamics of native and newly  
257 immobilized amino sugars in soil frequently amended with inorganic nitrogen and glucose. *Eur*  
258 *J Soil Sci* **62**: 144-151.  
259  
260 He H, Zhang W, Zhang X, Xie H, Zhuang J (2011b). Temporal responses of soil  
261 microorganisms to substrate addition as indicated by amino sugar differentiation. *Soil Biology*  
262 *and Biochemistry* **43**: 1155-1161.  
263  
264 Joergensen RG (2018). Amino sugars as specific indices for fungal and bacterial residues in

265 soil. *Biol Fertil Soils* **54**: 559-568.

266

267 Lauber CL, Strickland MS, Bradford MA, Fierer N (2008). The influence of soil properties on  
268 the structure of bacterial and fungal communities across land-use types. *Soil Biology and*  
269 *Biochemistry* **40**: 2407-2415.

270

271 Laughlin R, Rütting T, Müller C, Watson C, Stevens R (2009). Effect of acetate on soil  
272 respiration, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and gross N transformations related to fungi and bacteria in a  
273 grassland soil. *Applied Soil Ecology* **42**: 25-30.

274

275 Li X, He H, Zhang X, Yan X, Six J, Cai Z *et al* (2019). Distinct responses of soil fungal and  
276 bacterial nitrate immobilization to land conversion from forest to agriculture. *Soil Biology and*  
277 *Biochemistry* **134**: 81-89.

278

279 Li X, Li Z, Zhang X, Xia L, Zhang W, Ma Q *et al* (2020). Disentangling immobilization of nitrate  
280 by fungi and bacteria in soil to plant residue amendment. *Geoderma* **374**: 114450.

281

282 Liang C, Balser TC (2010). Mass spectrometric characterization of amino sugar aldonitrile  
283 acetate derivatives used for isotope enrichment assessment of microbial residues. *Soil Biology*  
284 *and Biochemistry* **42**: 904-909.

285

286 Liu X, Hu G, He H, Liang C, Zhang W, Bai Z *et al* (2016). Linking microbial immobilization of

287 fertilizer nitrogen to in situ turnover of soil microbial residues in an agro-ecosystem. *Agriculture,*  
288 *Ecosystems and Environment* **229**: 40-47.

289

290 Murphy DV, Recous S, Stockdale EA, Fillery IRP, Jensen LS, Hatch DJ *et al* (2003). Gross  
291 nitrogen fluxes in soil : theory, measurement and application of <sup>15</sup>N pool dilution techniques.  
292 *Advances in Agronomy*. Academic Press. pp 69-118.

293

294 Myrold DD, Posavatz NR (2007). Potential importance of bacteria and fungi in nitrate  
295 assimilation in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **39**: 1737-1743.

296

297 Parsons JW (1981). Chemistry and distribution of amino sugars in soils and soil organisms. In:  
298 E.A. Paul JNL (ed). *Soil Biochemistry*. Marcel Dekker: New York. pp 197-227.

299

300 Reay MK, Charteris AF, Jones DL, Evershed RP (2019a). <sup>15</sup>N-amino sugar stable isotope  
301 probing (<sup>15</sup>N-SIP) to trace the assimilation of fertiliser-N by soil bacterial and fungal  
302 communities. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **138**: 107599.

303

304 Reay MK, Knowles TDJ, Jones DL, Evershed RP (2019b). Development of Alditol Acetate  
305 Derivatives for the Determination of <sup>15</sup>N-Enriched Amino Sugars by Gas  
306 Chromatography–Combustion–Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometry. *Analytical Chemistry* **91**:  
307 3397-3404.

308

309 Recous S, Mary B, Faurie G (1990). Microbial immobilization of ammonium and nitrate in  
310 cultivated soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry***22**: 913-922.  
311  
312 Rousk J, Bååth E (2011). Growth of saprotrophic fungi and bacteria in soil. *FEMS Microbiol*  
313 *Ecol***78**: 17-30.  
314  
315 Six J, Frey SD, Thiet RK, Batten KM (2006). Bacterial and fungal contributions to carbon  
316 sequestration in agroecosystems. *Soil Science Society of America Journal***70**: 555-569.  
317  
318 Stark JM, Hart SC (1997). High rates of nitrification and nitrate turnover in undisturbed  
319 coniferous forests. *Nature***385**: 61-64.  
320  
321 Stres B, Tiedje JM (2006). New frontiers in soil microbiology: how to link structure and function  
322 of microbial communities? *Nucleic Acids and Proteins in Soil*. Springer. pp 1-22.  
323  
324 Tahovská K, Kaňa J, Bárta J, Oulehle F, Richter A, Šantrůčková H (2013). Microbial N  
325 immobilization is of great importance in acidified mountain spruce forest soils. *Soil Biology and*  
326 *Biochemistry***59**: 58-71.  
327  
328 Wackerly D, Mendenhall W, Scheaffer RL (2014). *Mathematical statistics with applications*.  
329 Cengage Learning.  
330



331 Waring BG, Averill C, Hawkes CV (2013). Differences in fungal and bacterial physiology alter  
332 soil carbon and nitrogen cycling: insights from meta-analysis and theoretical models. *Ecology*  
333 *Letters* **16**: 887-894.

334

335 Zhang J, Zhu T, Meng T, Zhang Y, Yang J, Yang W *et al* (2013). Agricultural land use affects  
336 nitrate production and conservation in humid subtropical soils in China. *Soil Biology and*  
337 *Biochemistry* **62**: 107-114.

338

339 Zhang W, Zhang X, Bai E, Cui Y, He H, Zhang X (2019). The strategy of microbial utilization of  
340 the deposited N in a temperate forest soil. *Biol Fertil Soils*: 1-9.

341

342 Zhang X, Amelung W (1996). Gas chromatographic determination of muramic acid,  
343 glucosamine, mannosamine, and galactosamine in soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **28**:  
344 1201-1206.

345

346 Zogg GP, Zak DR, Pregitzer KS, Burton AJ (2000). Microbial immobilization and the retention  
347 of anthropogenic nitrate in a northern hardwood forest. *Ecology* **81**: 1858-1866.

348