



HAL
open science

Using the ecosystem engineer concept to test the functional effects of a decrease in earthworm abundance due to an historic metal pollution gradient

Yvan Capowiez, T. Lévègue, Céline Pelosi, Line Capowiez, Christophe Mazzia, E. Schreck, C. Dumat

► To cite this version:

Yvan Capowiez, T. Lévègue, Céline Pelosi, Line Capowiez, Christophe Mazzia, et al.. Using the ecosystem engineer concept to test the functional effects of a decrease in earthworm abundance due to an historic metal pollution gradient. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 2021, 158, pp.103816. 10.1016/j.apsoil.2020.103816 . hal-03391776

HAL Id: hal-03391776

<https://amu.hal.science/hal-03391776>

Submitted on 21 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1
2 **Using the ecosystem engineer concept to test**
3 **the functional effects of a decrease in earthworm abundance**
4 **due to an historic metal pollution gradient**

5
6 Capowiez Y.^{1*}, Lévêque T.², Pelosi C.¹, Capowiez L.¹, Mazzia C.³, Schreck E.⁴, Dumat C.^{2,5}

7
8
9
10
11
12 ¹ INRAE, UMR 1114 EMMAH, INRAE-Université d'Avignon, Site Agroparc, 84914 Avignon cedex 09,
13 France.

14 ² INP-ENSAT, Toulouse, France

15 ³ Avignon Université, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, IRD, IMBE, Avignon, France.

16 ⁴ Géosciences Environnement Toulouse (GET), Observatoire Midi Pyrénées, Université de Toulouse, CNRS,
17 IRD, 14 avenue E. Belin, 31400 Toulouse, France.

18 ⁵ CERTOP, UMR 5044 CNRS, UT2J & UPS, Toulouse, France

19
20
21
22
23 Corresponding author: yvan.capowiez@inrae.fr

24 +33 4 32 72 24 38

25 INRAE UMR 1114 EMMAH, Site Agroparc, 84914 Avignon cedex 09, France.

26

27 **Abstract**

28 In a companion study, carried out in a fallow meadow close to a lead recycling factory, we showed that
29 earthworms were absent in the first 20 m and then gradually increased in abundance from 30 to 110 m from
30 the factory. Here we assessed in the same meadow whether these differences in earthworm abundance were
31 associated with the loss of physical soil properties. Soil cores were sampled and infiltration measured in situ
32 at five distances from the factory (10, 30, 50, 80 and 110 m). X-ray tomography was used to characterize the
33 earthworm burrow systems within cores. The burrow systems were minimal at the first two distances, with
34 the only macropores observed probably produced by insects such as ants. Typical earthworm burrows were
35 seen at 50 m but most of their characteristics (volume, diameter, continuity) were similar to those observed at
36 10 or 30 m. Dense and well-developed burrow systems were observed at 80 and 110 m from the factory with
37 significantly larger volume and continuity. Burrow diameter at 80 m was significantly higher than at closer
38 distances but it significantly decreased at 110 m associated with the higher abundance of endogeics
39 earthworm species. Water infiltration followed the same trend with significantly lower rates at the first two
40 distances compared to those further from the factory, where rates increased from 70 to 250%. This study
41 emphasizes the need to develop a more functional approach to study the spatial effects of contamination on
42 soil ecological processes and fertility, beyond modifications in earthworm communities.

43

44 **Keywords:** Burrow ; Macroporosity ; Water infiltration ; Lead

45

46 **1 Introduction**

47 Earthworms are generally considered soil « ecosystem engineers » (sensu Jones et al., 1994). This means
48 that, through their different activities (organic matter burial, burrow creation, cast deposition), these
49 organisms create favourable habitats and modified conditions of resource availability for many other soil
50 inhabitants, from micro-organisms to plant roots (Jouquet et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2019). For example, as
51 recently reviewed by Medina-Sauza et al. (2019) micro-organisms are more diverse and active close to the
52 burrow wall or fresh casts. Moreover, plant roots are often observed within earthworm burrows presumably
53 to save energy (Passioura, 2002). However, the concept of ecosystem engineer is now called upon in soil
54 biology as an easy way to justify the relevance of studies about earthworm communities. Yet quantitative
55 empirical evidence of the importance of earthworms for selected soil functions remain incredibly scarce,
56 especially under field conditions. For example, Blouin et al. (2013) reviewed the impacts of earthworms on
57 soil functions and ecosystem services but only cited two quite old studies which suggested that earthworm
58 abundance in some field studies was correlated with increased water infiltration (Ehlers et al., 1975; Bouché
59 and Al-Addan, 1997).

60 Earthworms are often chosen as model organisms for studying the biological effects of soil pollution
61 by metals or pesticides (Pelosi et al., 2014). However, in most studies, these effects were only assessed at the
62 community level without addressing the consequences on soil functioning. There are however a few
63 exceptions carried out under field conditions (Creamer et al., 2008; van Gestel et al., 2009; Naveed et al.,
64 2014) or in laboratory experiments (Zorn et al., 2005; Capowiez and Bérard, 2006; Prado et al., 2016;
65 Mombo et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019). In these experiments, pollutants were reported to negatively impact
66 earthworm communities and/or their main functions in soil ecosystems (soil macroporosity or organic matter
67 burial). Among them, studies that focused on soil macroporosity showed a relatively good agreement
68 between macrofauna abundance and soil macroporosity. However, in the absence of a strong disturbance
69 such as contamination, this relationship was not always observed in other ecological studies that tried to
70 correlate earthworm abundance to the density of burrows in croplands (Pérès et al., 1998; Lamandé et al.,
71 2011; van Schaik et al., 2014; Pelosi et al., 2017), at the colonization front (Capowiez et al., 2000) or at the
72 landscape scale (Schneider et al., 2018).

73

74 Indeed, soil porosity is important since soil structure greatly influences or even controls most soil
75 functions as reviewed by Rabot et al. (2018). According to these authors, macroporosity is one the most
76 relevant indicators of soil structure. Although macroporosity does not always have the same definition in soil
77 physics and soil biology (Bottinelli et al., 2015), the macropores that earthworms or other soil inhabitants
78 create strongly influence water infiltration through preferential flow (Badorreck et al., 2012; van Schaik et
79 al., 2014), which in turn is also thought to increase water storage in soil and limit soil erosion. Different
80 methods are available to directly or indirectly assess soil structure (Rabot et al., 2018) and with regards to
81 earthworm burrow systems, X-ray tomography using medical scanners is a common approach due to its
82 accuracy and availability in hospitals or research institutes (Pierret et al., 2002; Amossé et al., 2015;
83 Bottinelli et al., 2017). Overall, experiments carried out under laboratory conditions (Capowiez et al., 2015;
84 Bottinelli et al., 2017), semi-field (Capowiez et al., 2009a; Andriuzzi et al., 2015; Schon et al., 2017) or field
85 conditions (Capowiez et al., 2012) demonstrated that when earthworm abundance increased, water
86 infiltration did the same, presumably associated with macroporosity. The role of burrows made by anecic
87 earthworms, which are vertical and continuous, is relatively clear but there is less evidence for endogeic
88 burrows (Capowiez et al., 2014b). Among the characteristics of the burrow system that are thought to be
89 important for water infiltration (e.g. burrow length, continuity or connectivity), no consensus has yet
90 emerged mainly due to the scarcity of datasets where all these parameters were accurately and
91 simultaneously measured.

92 In the present study, we benefited from a previous study (Lévêque et al., 2015) focusing on
93 earthworm abundance and diversity along a sharp gradient of pluri-metallic persistent contamination in a
94 fallow land close to an old lead-recycling factory. We previously showed that earthworm abundance
95 increased from zero close to the factory wall to 150 individuals m⁻² at 140 m from this wall. We decided to
96 use this gradient to test, under field conditions, the relationships between earthworm communities, soil
97 macroporosity and water infiltration in this meadow. For that, we sampled soil cores and carried out in situ
98 water infiltration tests at four distances from the wall (10, 30, 50, 80 and 110 m). We hypothesized that (i) the
99 volume and length of the earthworm burrow system will gradually increase with earthworm abundance and
100 that (ii) the characteristics of the burrow system will depend on the proportions of anecic and endogeic
101 earthworms in the community.

102

103 **2. Material and Methods**

104 *2.1. The study site*

105 The study site is located in Bazoches-les-Gallérandes (N 48.164554, E 2.042537), 80 km south of Paris,
106 France. The study was carried out in a fallow metallophyte meadow, on a calcic cambisol (clay: 22.8% ; silt
107 54.6% ; sand : 22.6% ; A horizon 0-25 cm depth), adjoining a lead recycling factory: the Société de
108 Traitements Chimiques des Métaux (STCM) which has been in operation since 1967. This plant treats lead
109 batteries and the recycling process is carried out in several stages (crushing, fusion, reduction and refining),
110 each generating, in addition to Pb, undesirable by-products such as Cu, Zn, As and Sb. Metal and metalloids
111 are emitted from the factory through a chimney (furnace emissions) and diffuse emissions are also produced
112 due to the recycling processes. The prevailing winds blow from the South-West. Thus, the soil of the
113 meadow (located in the North of the factory) was contaminated with a cocktail of metal and metalloids due
114 to atmospheric fallout with, for example, soil lead concentrations ranging from 29600 at 10 m to 480 mg kg⁻¹
115 at 140 m from the factory wall. The French “ICPE” regulation was recently reinforced to not only avoid
116 environmental emissions near habitations, but also to manage persistent historic pollution in order to reduce
117 its impacts on health and the environment.

118 In spring 2013, we selected five distances (10, 30, 50, 80 and 110 m) based on the findings of the
119 previous study (Lévêque et al., 2015): there were no worms at 10 m; the earthworm abundance increased
120 between 30 and 50 m but remained very low (less than 20 individuals m⁻²); from 50 to 80 and 110 m the
121 abundance greatly increased up to about 125 individuals m⁻². The mean abundance of the anecic and
122 endogeic earthworms at these distances is summarized in Table 1. Key soil parameters (pH, C_{organic}, N_{total}) along
123 the gradient can be found in Lévêque et al., 2015.

124 *2.2. Assessment of the burrow system*

125 In spring 2013, for each of the five chosen distances (10, 30, 50, 80 and 110 m from the factory wall), eight
126 soil cores were sampled across the transects of the previous study. Soil cores were manually taken using a
127 PVC tube (16 cm in diameter and 20 cm in length). An undisturbed soil zone was selected and the PVC tube
128 was placed vertically on the soil. The soil around the tube was carefully excavated up to a width of 15 cm

129 and up to a depth of a few cm using a small hand-spade. Then the soil just and only below the PVC tube was
130 removed using a knife vertically cm by cm. After each cm, the tube was gently inserted in the soil using a
131 hammer on top of the PVC tube. The process continued until the depth of the soil core within the PVC was
132 15 cm. It took at least 30 min to sample one soil core. The soil below the core was horizontally cut with a
133 knife and the core was put in a plastic bag. The macrofauna inside each core was killed to prevent further
134 burrowing by pouring 3 mL of chloroform on top of each core and closing the bags.

135 The macroporosity within the soil cores was analysed by X-ray tomography using a medical scanner
136 (BrightSpeed Exel 4, General Electric) at the INRAE Nancy research centre. The scanner settings were 50
137 kV and 130 mA and 1.25 mm between images. The final image resolution was 0.38 mm per pixel. The
138 images were first transformed into 8-bit images (using the following settings –1000 and 2000 HU as
139 minimum and maximum greylevel values, respectively) and then binarized using a fixed threshold (185)
140 since the separation between peaks (void and soil matrix) in the greylevel histograms was obvious.

141 The macroporosity was characterised using the following parameters: the volume as the sum of the volumes
142 of the burrows (excluding those smaller than 0.5 cm³); the number of burrows; the percentage of
143 macroporosity in four soil layers (0-5, 5-10, 10-15 and 15-20 cm depth); the estimated diameter computed as
144 the equivalent circular diameter for only the most circular 2D pores (i.e. whose circularity, computed in
145 ImageJ, was higher than 0.8); the vertical continuity assessed by counting the number of burrows whose
146 vertical extension was larger than 30% of the length of the soil cores (i.e. 6 cm).

147

148 *2.3. Water infiltration*

149 Water infiltration was assessed in situ in the fallow meadow at 10 locations (separated by at least 5 m from
150 each other) for each distance to the factory wall. These locations were positioned on the same line (i.e.
151 distance from the factory wall) but not at the same location where soil cores were sampled. For each point, a
152 30 cm (diameter) PVC ring was inserted into the soil for 1 or 2 cm. The vegetation was cut within the ring.
153 Then known volumes of water (corresponding to a height of 1 cm) were poured within the ring and the time
154 before complete absorption into the soil was noted. As soon as the water disappeared a new volume was
155 added until steady state conditions were reached (i.e. the same time between volumes which occurred after
156 about 8 to 10 volumes under our conditions). The resulting water infiltration rates were computed as the

157 coefficient of linear regression for the last 6 to 5 points (when steady state was reached ; see Fig.1 in
158 Capowiez et al., 2015). Since the cores were not sampled at the same location where water infiltration was
159 assessed, we did not try to correlate water infiltration rate to burrow system characteristics. These
160 correlations with only five points (i.e. distances) would have been of limited interest.

161

162 *2.4. Statistical analysis*

163 To compare the different parameters (relative to macroporosity or infiltration) between distances to the
164 factory wall, we used one-way ANOVA followed by a Tukey HSD post-hoc test. First, normality or
165 homoscedasticity were checked using Levene and Bartlett tests respectively and data were log-transformed
166 when necessary (for example for diameter). Continuity, as count data with a lot of zero values, was compared
167 using zero-inflated regression (using 'pscl' package). All computations were carried out using R (R core
168 team, 2019).

169

170 **3. Results**

171 *3.1. Burrow system*

172 In the images provided by the medical scanner, the mean greylevels corresponding to the soil matrix were
173 not significantly different between the core samples taken at varying distances to the factory wall suggesting
174 that there was no significant variation in the soil bulk density.

175 Visual assessment of the burrow systems showed clear differences in terms of density, continuity,
176 global design and size, between the two first distances (10 and 30 m) and the others (Fig. 1). The burrow
177 systems at 10 and 30 m were less developed in depth and showed relatively intense burrowing in the first cm
178 with burrows that appeared to be mostly horizontally orientated. No obvious differences could be visually
179 observed for the soil cores sampled at the three last distances.

180 Macroporosity volume increased with distance to the factory wall albeit non-linearly. The volume
181 was low (about 20 cm³) for 10 and 30 m (Fig. 2). Then it increased a bit but was very variable at 50 m and
182 thus was not significantly different from the two first distances. However, at 80 and 110 m it increased
183 significantly to an average of 50 cm³ (i.e. an increase of about 250% compared to the volume observed at 10
184 and 30 m).

185 The estimated burrow diameter first increased from 10 to 80 m with mean values increasing from 3.3 to 4.4
186 mm and then decreased at 110 m with a mean value of 3.7 mm (Fig. 3). Only the burrow diameter at 80 m
187 was significantly different from those observed at all the other distances.

188 The continuity of the burrow systems (i.e. the number of burrows whose vertical extension is larger than 6
189 cm) was significantly lower at 10, 30 and 50 m (with on average 1.6 burrows) than at 80 and 110 m (with on
190 average 6.3 burrows) as reported in Fig. 4.

191 Regarding the distribution of burrow volume with depth, the volume of the burrow system was
192 always highest in the first layer. Moreover, the proportion of the burrow system in the four layers became
193 more homogeneous the further the cores were sampled from the factory, with almost equality in the four
194 layers at 110 m (Table 2).

195 The number of burrows ranged from 80 at 50 m to 280 at 110 m and was significantly higher furthest
196 from the factory (Table 2).

197

198 *3. 2. Water infiltration*

199 The water infiltration rate was very low at 10 and 30 m from the factory wall, with on average 1 L mn⁻¹ or
200 less (Fig. 5). It then significantly increased at 50 m and at 80 m to 1.7 and 2.6 L mn⁻¹ respectively, these two
201 values being significantly different from each other. At 110 m the water infiltration rate decreased slightly
202 but was still significantly different from the first two distances but not from 50 and 80 m.

203

204 **4. Discussion**

205 *4.1. Relationships between earthworm communities and soil functions are not straightforward*

206 In a previous study carried out in the spring of 2012 in this meadow, earthworm communities were assessed
207 along five linear transects from 0 to 140 m from the factory wall (Lévêque et al., 2015): no earthworms were
208 found from 0 to 20 m and then the abundance increased to reach about 240 individuals m⁻² at 140 m from the
209 factory walls. In the present study, the first striking result is that despite an absence of earthworms in the first
210 20 m from the factory wall, some macropores were found in soil cores sampled at 10 m. This suggest that
211 either other arthropods were active in the soil (e.g. insects) or that these macropores were « ghost burrows »
212 or both. Indeed, due to the relatively high earthworm abundance in most agricultural lands, the role of other

213 burrowing soil macrofauna is often neglected. Is it then not surprising that their role is more often revealed in
214 highly perturbed soils such as metal contaminated soils (Nahmani et al., 1995), at the initial soil development
215 stages (Badorreck et al., 2012) or during the restoration of degraded lands (Yang et al., 2020). Generally,
216 these soil-dwelling insects produce burrows that are open to the surface and not very deep (about a few cm).
217 The intense and superficial burrowing in the soil cores at 10 and 30 m could be due to such insects (Fig. 1).
218 The other important soil ecosystem engineer in temperate climates is the ants which are known to make nests
219 and burrows within the soil. On some 3D reconstructions of soil cores sampled at 10 m from the factory wall,
220 we observed round-shaped structures connected by small vertical burrows (see Fig. 1 first image in the
221 second row). These looked like structures resulting from ant activities (Li et al., 2019). Ghost burrows would
222 mean that earthworms, which are no longer present or active due to soil pollution, made these burrows in the
223 past. Indeed, there is limited information on the rate of burrow disintegration in a meadow where no tillage is
224 applied and, as observed by Potvin and Lilleskov (2017) some burrows can last for more than seven years.
225 Although in that specific case the burrows were inhabited and thus maintained by earthworms.

226 At 30 and 50 m, the earthworm abundance remained very low with about five and 10 individuals m⁻²
227 respectively, and almost only anecic adult earthworms were sampled there (Lévêque et al., 2015). However,
228 the earthworm burrow systems observed at 10, 30 and 50 m were very similar. This simply means that with
229 such low abundance and eight soil cores of 0.02 m² each, the probability of observing a burrow was thus very
230 low. We only noticed that the variability and the mean values, increased, albeit non-significantly, at 50
231 compared to 10 or 30 m for all parameters computed on the burrow systems. At 80 m, pronounced and
232 significant changes in the burrow systems were observed. The burrow systems were now well-developed
233 with burrow volume, diameter and continuity. Consequently, water infiltration was also much higher
234 (+190%). The increase in burrow diameter also suggests than the burrows observed at 10 and 30 m were
235 either made by small insects and possibly ants or were degraded and thus possibly old (Le Mer et al., 2021).
236 At 110 m the burrow system was also well-developed with high burrow volume and continuity. However, the
237 burrow diameter decreased and this was linked to the fact that at 110 m, earthworm communities comprised
238 a much greater proportion of endogeic earthworms (their percentage increased from 10 to 45% between 90
239 and 120 m; Lévêque et al., 2015). The body diameter of endogeic species is generally lower than those of

240 anecics (Bouché, 1972; Lee and Foster, 1991) and this is particularly true in this meadow where the only
241 endogeic species found were *A. caliginosa*, *A. rosea* and *A. chlorotica*. The changes in burrow continuity between
242 80 and 110 m (a non-significant decrease) could perhaps be due to the greater percentage of endogeics at 110
243 m since it is known that endogeics refilled their burrows by casts (Capowiez et al., 2014a; Bottinelli et al.,
244 2017).

245 At a first glance, there should be a direct relationship between earthworm communities (abundance
246 and diversity) and the resulting tubular macroporosity within the soil especially in croplands under temperate
247 climate (in other lands or climates, ants and other insects may play a larger role). The diameter range for
248 macroporosity that can be assessed using a medical scanner normally excludes macropores created by (dead)
249 roots except for some plants with large roots such as alfalfa or other taproots (Koestel and Schlüter, 2019),
250 which were not observed in this meadow. However, the relationship between macropores and earthworm
251 abundance is not actually straightforward mainly due to the following reasons: (i) not all earthworm species
252 burrow continuously and (ii) the rate of burrow disintegration which is influenced by soil texture, soil
253 climate and land use is still poorly known (Ligthart, 1997; Capowiez et al., 2014a). Regarding rate of burrow
254 creation, it is well known that, for example, most if not all endogeic species tend to burrow continuously as
255 soon as the conditions (soil water content and temperature) are within optimal ranges (Roeben et al., 2020).
256 In contrast, epianecic species such as *L. terrestris* first build a main quasi-vertical burrow, a shelter, and then
257 reuse it intensively to forage at the soil surface during the night and to hide at depth during the day (Joyner
258 and Harmon, 1961; Nuutinen and Butt, 2005). The two kinds of resulting burrows are also very different
259 regarding stability in time: as *L. terrestris* intensively re-uses its burrow and crushes some casts along the
260 burrow wall, these burrows are long-lasting especially when inhabited (Potvin and Lilleskov, 2017). In
261 contrast, endogeic burrows are rarely reused and often refilled by casts (Capowiez et al., 2014a) and thought
262 to be more fragile (Lee and Foster, 1991).

263 When analyzing earthworm burrow systems, even an a priori separation between endogeic and
264 anecic species based on the burrow diameter is complicated since young anecic earthworms, which are often
265 more abundant than adults, may have the same diameter range as older endogeic earthworms (Pérès et al.,
266 1998). Moreover, the separation into three exclusive ecological categories leads to some confusion for

267 species that are in between the three poles defined by Bouché (1977). For example, *A. trapezoides* is sometimes
268 classified as anecic, *L. terrestris* is classified as anecic or epi-anecic depending on the authors and *A. chlorotica* is
269 classified as an endogeic whereas Bouché unambiguously stated that this species was ‘intermediate’, i.e. in
270 between the three poles (Bottinelli et al., 2020). This further adds to our difficulties to really distinguish the
271 species or ecological categories involved in each burrow system. However, despite these complications,
272 some authors reported significant correlations between earthworm communities and macropore quantity
273 under field conditions even though the percentage of variance explained remained low and below 10%
274 (Schneider et al., 2018).

275 There are also similar difficulties to establish a clear and consistent relationship between soil macroporosity
276 and soil water infiltration. Although the importance of preferential flow is largely recognized (Jarvis et al.,
277 2016), the macropore characteristics which have the most influence and the conditions for which this
278 phenomenon is dominant remains an open question (Nimmo, 2012). Specifically, regarding earthworm
279 burrows and water infiltration, the main problem is that not all macropores contribute equally to water
280 infiltration. This was clearly demonstrated in field experiments using blue tracers (Capowiez et al., 2009b;
281 van Schaik et al., 2014), but also more recently using ‘time-lapse’ X-ray tomography and simulated rain
282 applied to a natural soil core (Sammartino et al., 2015). This last study showed that some macropores
283 contributed a lot (water was detected in them for most of the scanning event, i.e. every 3 min) whereas others
284 contributed far less (water was not often or rarely detected in them).

285

286 *4.2. Towards a more functional approach of investigating soil contamination effects*

287 Several very recent publications in the area of ecotoxicology described new tools for detecting toxic effects
288 on earthworms using locomotion or burrowing activities as endpoints (Lee et al., 2019; Djerdj et al., 2020;
289 Xu et al., 2020) with the authors suggesting that earthworm activities are crucial for predicting the impacts
290 on soil functioning. This leads to a paradoxical situation because the consequences of the observed effects
291 on earthworms are rarely studied. Thus, ecotoxicology and risk assessment procedures may not really
292 address the “things that matter” in protecting the environment (Forbes and Calow, 2012), i.e., ecosystems
293 services provided by ecosystem engineers. Therefore, we believe it is crucial for field studies to go beyond

294 the simple characterization of earthworm communities and to also measure changes to soil functions
295 traditionally associated with earthworm activities such as soil structure or organic matter burial. Examples of
296 such complete assessments are, however, rare, especially under field conditions. Naveed et al. (2014)
297 described the effects of field Cu contamination on several soil organisms and a set of chemical and physical
298 soil characteristics. They observed that soil porosity (assessed using X-ray tomography) and gas diffusivity
299 (related to soil aeration) decreased with increasing Cu concentration. Other rare examples of functional
300 effects can be found in field studies with emphasis on soil porosity (Eijsackers et al., 2005), cast production
301 (Lal et al., 2001; Norgrove, 2007), and litter decomposition (Creamer et al., 2008; van Gestel et al., 2009).
302 In addition, some studies under laboratory conditions investigated macroporosity or burrows (Nahmani et al.,
303 2005; Dittbrenner et al., 2011; Prado et al., 2016), cast production (Capowiez et al., 2010), rate of litter burial
304 (Hobbelen et al., 2006), gas diffusion (Capowiez and Bérard, 2006) and water infiltration (Zaller et al.,
305 2014). A last example, applicable to forest soils only, is the use of an 'humus index' as an indicator of the
306 macrofauna activity in response to industrial pollution (Korkina and Vorobeichik, 2018).
307 These examples remain scarce, but one important point to keep in mind is that nowadays the necessary tools
308 are readily available and do not require highly specialised skills. To assess the soil macroporosity resulting
309 from earthworm activities, X-ray tomography is a useful tool but image processing and structure
310 quantification remains tricky. Otherwise, simplified estimates are available for field studies and are based on
311 visual assessment and counting or the use of pictures of vertical openings of macropores on vertical planes
312 under field conditions (Capowiez et al., 2009a; Lamandé et al., 2011; van Schaik et al., 2014). For lab
313 experiments using soil cores, the quantification of the burrows along the core walls is also feasible
314 (Capowiez et al., 2014a). The assessment of associated soil functions under field conditions could rely on
315 widely used classical field methods such a litterbags (Lucisine et al., 2015) or the Beerkan method
316 (Bagarello et al., 2017). All these technics are to be used if we want to demonstrate quantitatively the role of
317 earthworms in soil functioning and thus provide further evidence on the ecosystem engineer concept.

318

319 **Conclusions**

320 If we want to be able to evaluate the impacts of contaminants in soils at the ecosystem level, it is crucial to
321 measure soil functions under field conditions. To achieve this aim, earthworms are an interesting target group

322 as these soil organisms can directly or indirectly influence a wide range of soil processes. This, however,
323 requires better knowledge of the relationships between earthworm activities (burrow creation, cast
324 production and litter decomposition) and soil functions (aeration, water infiltration and biogeochemical
325 cycles). To date, only qualitative relationships are available (Keith and Anderson, 2012). Moreover, these
326 relationships were always based on the use of earthworm ecological categories (i.e epigeics, endogeics, and
327 anecics) as functional groups. However, there is more and more evidence that variation within these
328 ecological categories can sometimes be very high (as observed by Bastardie et al. (2005) for burrowing
329 behaviour) or unexpectedly low or null (as recently observed by van Groenigen et al. (2019) for the fertility
330 of earthworm casts). The findings of the present study suggest that ecotoxicology, by providing atypical
331 situations and sharp gradients, can lead to a better understanding of the functioning of the soil ecosystem.
332 Further, various kinds of polluted soils could be studied in order to highlight the precise ecological and
333 biogeochemical mechanisms involved.

334

335 *Acknowledgments*

336 We sincerely thank the director of the STCM society for his collaboration and fruitful discussions.

337

338 **References**

- 339 Amossé, J., Turberg, P., Kohler-Milleret, R., Gobat, J.M., Le Bayon, R.C., 2015. Effects of
340 endogeic earthworms on the soil organic matter dynamics and the soil structure in
341 urban and alluvial materials. *Geoderma* 243, 50-57.
- 342 Andriuzzi, W.S., Pulleman, M.M., Schmidt, O., Faber, J.H., Brussaard, L., 2015. Anecic
343 earthworms (*Lumbricus terrestris*) alleviate negative effects of extreme rainfall events on
344 soil and plants in field mesocosms. *Plant Soil* 397, 103-113.
- 345 Badorrek, A., Gerke, H.H., Huts, R.F., 2012. Effects of ground-dwelling beetle burrows on
346 infiltration patterns and pore structure of the initial surfaces. *Vadose Zone J.* 11,
347 10.2136/vzj2011.0109.
- 348 Bagarello, V., di Prima, S., Iovino, M., 2017. Estimating saturated soil hydraulic conductivity
349 by the near steady-state phase of a Beerkan infiltration test. *Geoderma* 303, 60-69.
- 350 Bastardie, F., Capowiez, Y., Renault, P., Cluzeau, D., 2005. A radio-labelled study of
351 earthworm behaviour in artificial soil cores in term of ecological types. *Biol. Fertil.*
352 *Soils* 41, 320-327.
- 353 Blouin, M., Hodson, M.E., Delgado, E.A., Baker, G., Brussaard, L., Butt, K.R., Dai, J.,
354 Dendooven, L., Pérès, G., Tondoh, J.E., Cluzeau, D., Brun, J-J. 2013. A review of

355 earthworm impact on soil function and ecosystem services. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 64, 161–
356 182.

357 Bottinelli, N., Jouquet, P., Capowiez, Y., Podwojewski, P., Grimaldi, M., Peng, X., 2015. Why is
358 the influence of soil macrofauna on soil structure only considered by soil ecologists?
359 *Soil Tillage Res.* 146, 118-124.

360 Bottinelli, N., Zhou, H., Capowiez, Y., Zhang, Z.B., Qiu, J., Jouquet, P., Peng, X.H., 2017.
361 Earthworm burrowing activity of two non-lumbricidae earthworm species incubated
362 in soils with contrasting carbon content (Vertisol vs. Ultisol). *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 53, 951-
363 955.

364 Bottinelli, N., Hedde, M., Jouquet, P., Capowiez, Y., 2020. An explicit definition of earthworm
365 ecological categories – Marcel Bouché’s triangle revisited. *Geoderma* 372:114361.

366 Bouché, M.B., 1972. *Lombriciens de France: Ecologie et Systématique*. INRA, Paris.

367 Bouché, M.B., 1977. Stratégies lombriciennes, in: Lohm, U., Persson T. (Eds), *Soil Organisms*
368 as Components of Ecosystems, *Ecology Bulletin*, NFR, Stockholm, pp. 122– 132.

369 Bouché, M.B., Al-Addan, F., 1997. Earthworms, water infiltration and soil stability: some new
370 assessments. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 29, 441– 452.

371 Capowiez, Y., Bérard, A. (2006) Assessment of the effects of imidacloprid on the behavior of
372 two earthworm species (*Aporrectodea nocturna* and *Allolobophora chlorotica*) using 2D terraria.
373 Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf. 64, 198-206.

374 Capowiez, Y., Pierret, A., Monestiez, P., Belzunces, L., 2000. Evolution of the burrow systems
375 after the accidental introduction of a new earthworm species in a Swiss pre-alpine
376 meadow. Biol. Fertil. Soils 31, 494-500.

377 Capowiez, Y., Cadoux, S., Bouchand, P., Roger-Estrade, J., Richard, G., Boizard, H., 2009a
378 Estimating the role of earthworms in regenerating compacted soils: field observations
379 and semi-field experimental study. Soil Biol. Biochem. 41, 711-717.

380 Capowiez, Y., Cadoux, S., Bouchand, P., Ruy, S., Roger-Estrade, J., Richard, G., Boizard, H.,
381 2009b. The influence of tillage type and compaction on earthworm communities and
382 the conséquences for macroporosity and water infiltration in crop fields. Soil Tillage
383 Res. 105, 209-216.

384 Capowiez Y., Dittbrenner N., Rault M., Hedde, M., Triebkorn R., Mazzia C. (2010)
385 Earthworm cast production as a new behavioural biomarker for toxicity testing.
386 Environ. Pollut. 158, 388-393.

387 Capowiez Y., Sammartino S., Cadoux S., Bouchant P., Richard G., Boizard H. 2012. Role of
388 earthworm in regenerating soil structure after compaction in reduced tillage systems.
389 Soil Biol. Biochem. 55, 93-103.

390 Capowiez, Y., Bottinelli, N., Jouquet, P., 2014a. Quantitative estimates of burrow
391 construction and destruction, by anecic and endogeic earthworms in repacked soil
392 cores. Appl. Soil Ecol. 74, 46-50.

393 Capowiez, Y., Sammartino, S., Michel, E., 2014b. Burrow systems of endogeic earthworms:
394 effects of earthworm abundance and consequences for soil water infiltration.
395 Pedobiologia 57, 303-309.

396 Capowiez, Y., Bottinelli, N., Sammartino, S., Michel, E., Jouquet, P., 2015. Morphological and
397 functional characterisation of the burrow systems of six earthworm species
398 (Lumbricidae). Biol. Fertil. Soils 51, 869-877.

399 Creamer, R.E., Rimmer, D.L., Black, H.I.J., 2008. Do elevated soil concentrations of metals
400 affect the diversity and activity of soil invertebrate in the long-term? Soil Use Manag.
401 24, 37-46.

402 Dittbrenner, N, Moser, I, Triebkorn, R, Capowiez, Y., 2011. Assessment of short and long-
403 term effects of imidacloprid on the burrowing behaviour of two earthworm species

404 (*Aporrectodea caliginosa* and *Lumbricus terrestris*) by using 2D and 3D post-exposure
405 techniques. Chemosphere 84, 1349-1355.

406 Djerdj, T., Hackenberger, D.K., Hackenberger, D.K., Hackenberger, B.K., 2020. Observing
407 earthworm behavior using deep learning. Geoderma 358, 113977.

408 Ehlers, W., 1975. Observations on earthworm channels and infiltration on tilled and untilled
409 loess soil. Soil Sci. 119, 242– 249.

410 Eijsackers, H., Beneke, P., Maboeta, M., 2005. The implication of copper fungicide usage in
411 vineyards for earthworm activity and resulting sustainable soil quality. Ecotoxicol.
412 Environ. Saf. 62, 99-111.

413 Forbes VE, Calow P 2012. Promises and problems for the new paradigm for risk assessment
414 and an alternative approach involving predictive systems models. Environ. Toxicol.
415 Chem. 31, 2663-2671.

416 Hobbelen, P.H.F., Koolhaas, J.E., van Gestel, C.A.M., 2005. Effects of heavy metals on the
417 litter consumption by the earthworm *Lumbricus rubellus* in field soils. Pedobiologia 50, 51-
418 60.

419 Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H., Shachak, M., 1994. Organisms as ecosystem engineers. Oikos 69,
420 373-386.

- 421 Jarvis, N., Larsbo, M., Koestel, J., 2016. Understanding preferential flow in the vadose zone:
422 recent advances and future prospects. *Vadose Zone J.* 15, 10.2136/vzj2016.09.0075.
- 423 Jouquet, P., Bottinelli, N., Capowiez, Y., 2014. Utilization of earthworms and termites for the
424 restoration of ecosystem functioning. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 60, 49-62.
- 425 Joyner, J.W., Harmon, N.P., 1961. Burrows and oscillative behavior therein of *Lumbricus*
426 *terrestris*. *Proc. Indiana Acad. Sci.* 71, 378-384.
- 427 Keith, A.M., Anderson, D.A., 2012. Earthworms as natural capital: ecosystem service
428 providers in agricultural soils. *Economology J.* 2, 91-99.
- 429 Koestel, J., Schlüter, S., 2019. Quantification of the structure evolution in a garden soil over
430 the course of two years. *Geoderma* 338, 597-609.
- 431 Korkina, I.N., Vorobeichik, E.L., 2018. Humus Index as an indicator of the topsoil response
432 to the impacts of industrial pollution. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 123, 455-463.
- 433 Lal, O.P., Palta, R.K., Srivastava, Y.N.S., 2001. Impact of imidacloprid and carbofuran on
434 earthworm castings in Okra field. *Ann. Plant Prot. Sci.* 9, 137-138.

- 435 Lamandé, M., Labouriau, R., Holmstrup, M., Torp, S.B., Greve, M.H., Heckrath, C., Iversen,
436 B.V., de Jonge, L.W., Moldrup, P., Jacobsen, O.H., 2011. Density of macropores as
437 related to soil and earthworm community parameters in cultivated grasslands.
438 *Geoderma* 162, 319-326.
- 439 Le Mer, G., Jouquet, P., Capowiez, Y., Maeght, J.-L., Minh Tran, T., Can, T., Bottinelli, N., 2021.
440 Age matters: dynamics of casts and burrows made by the anecic earthworm *Amyntas*
441 *khami* and their effects on soil water transfer. *Geoderma*, 382, 114709.
- 442 Lee, K.E., Foster, R.C., 1991. Soil fauna and soil structure. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 29, 745-775.
- 443 Lee, W.C., Lee, S.W., Jeon, J.H., Jung, H., Kim, S.O., 2019. A novel method for real-time
444 monitoring of soil ecological toxicity - Detection of earthworm motion using a
445 vibration sensor. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 185, 109677.
- 446 Lévêque, T., Capowiez, Y., Schreck, E., Mombo, S., Mazzia, C., Foucault, Y., Dumat C., 2015.
447 Effects of historic metal(loid) pollution on earthworm communities. *Sci. Total Environ.*
448 511, 738-746.

449 Li, T.C., Shao, M.A., Jia, Y.H., Jia, X.X., Huang, L.M., Gan, M., 2019. Small-scale observations
450 on the effect of burrowing activities of ants on soil hydraulic processes. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*
451 70, 236-244.

452 Ligthart, T.N., 1997. Thin section analysis of earthworm burrow disintegration in a
453 permanent pasture. *Geoderma* 75, 135-148.

454 Liu, T., Chen, X., Gong, X., Lubbers, I.M., Jiang, Y., Feng, W., Li, X., Whalen J.K., Bonkowski,
455 M., Griffiths B.S., Hu, F., Liu M., 2019. Earthworms coordinate soil biota to improve
456 multiple ecosystem functions. *Cur. Biol.* 29, 3420-3429.

457 Lucisine, P., Lecerf, A., Danger, M., Felten, V., Aran, D., Auclerc, A., Gross, E.M., Huot, H.,
458 Morel, J.-L., Muller, S., Nahmani, J., Manoury-Danger, F., 2015. Litter chemistry prevails
459 over litter consumers in mediating effects of past steel industry activities on leaf litter
460 decomposition. *Sci. Total Environ.* 537, 213-224.

461 Medina-Sauza, R.M., Alvarez-Jimenez, M., Delhal, A., Reverchon, F., Blouin, M., Guerrero-
462 Analco, J.A., Cerdan, C.R., Guevara, R., Villain, L., Barois I., 2019. Earthworms building
463 up soil microbiota, a review. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 7, 81.

- 464 Mombo, S., Laplanche, C., Besson, P., Sammartino, S., Schreck, E., Dumat, C., Capowiez, Y.,
465 2018. Metal soil pollution differentially affects both the behaviour and exposure of *A.*
466 *caliginosa* and *L. terrestris*. Biol. Fertil. Soils 54, 319-328.
- 467 Nahmani, J., Capowiez, Y., Lavelle, P., 2005. Effects of metal pollution on soil
468 macroinvertebrate burrow systems. Biol. Fertil. Soils 42, 31-39.
- 469 Naveed, M., Moldrup, P., Arthur, E., Holmstrup, M., Nicolaisen, M., Tuller, M., Herath, L.,
470 Hamamoto, S., Kamamoto, K., Komatsu, T., Vogel, H.-J., de Jonge, L.W., 2014.
471 Simultaneous loss of soil biodiversity and functions along a copper contamination
472 gradient: when soil goes to sleep. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 78, 1239-1250.
- 473 Nimmo, J.R. 2012. Preferential flow occurs in unsaturated conditions. Hydrol. Processes 26,
474 786-789.
- 475 Norgrove, L., 2007. Effects of different copper fungicide application rates upon earthworm
476 activity and impacts on cocoa yield over four years. Eur. J. Soil Biol. 43, 303-310.
- 477 Nuutinen, V., Butt, K.R., 2005. Homing ability widens the sphere of influence of the
478 earthworm *Lumbricus terrestris* L. Soil Biol. Biochem. 37, 805-807.
- 479 Passioura J.B. 2002. Soil conditions and plant growth. Plant Cell Environ. 25, 311-318.

480 Pelosi, C., Barot, S.B., Capowiez, Y., Hedde, M.L., Vandenbulcke, F., 2013. Pesticides and
481 earthworms. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 34, 199-228.

482 Pelosi, C., Grandeau, G., Capowiez, Y., 2017. Temporal dynamics of earthworm communities
483 and associated burrow systems in tilled and non-tilled cropping systems. *Geoderma*
484 289, 169-177.

485 Pérès, G., Cluzeau, D., Curmi, P., Hallaire, V., 1998. Earthworm activities and soil structure
486 changes due to organic enrichments in vineyards systems. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 27, 417-
487 424.

488 Pierret, A., Capowiez, Y., Belzunces, L., Moran, C.J., 2002. 3D reconstruction and
489 quantification of macropores using an integrated, image-processing based
490 methodology. *Geoderma* 106, 247-271.

491 Potvin, L.R., Lilleskov, E.A., 2017. Introduced earthworm species exhibited unique patterns
492 of seasonal activity and vertical distribution, and *Lumbricus terrestris* burrows remained
493 usable for at least 7 years in hardwood and pine stands. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 53, 187-198.

494 Prado, B., Gastelum Strozzi, A., Huerta, E., Duwig, C., Zamora, O., Delmas, P., Casasola, D.,
495 Marquez, J., 2016. 2,4-D mobility in clay soils: Impacts of macrofauna abundance on
496 soil porosity. *Geoderma* 279, 87-96.

497 R Core Team, 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
498 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>

499 Rabot, E., Wiesmeier, M., Schlüter, S., Vogel, H.-J., 2018. Soil structure as an indicator of soil
500 functions: a review. *Geoderma* 314, 122-137.

501 Roeben, V., Oberdoerster, S., Capowiez, Y., Ernst, G., Preuss, T.G., Gergs, A., Oberdoerster,
502 C., 2020. Towards a spatiotemporally explicit toxicokinetic-toxicodynamic model for
503 earthworm toxicity. *Sci. Total Environ.* 722, 137673.

504 Sammartino, S., Lissy, A.-S., Bogner, C., van den Boogaert, R., Capowiez, Y., Ruy, S., Cornu,
505 S., 2015. Identifying the functional macropore network related to preferential flow in
506 structured soils. *Vadose Zone J.* 14, 10.2136/vzj2015.05.0070.

507 Schneider, A.-K., Hohenbrink, T.L., Reck, A., Zangerlé, A., Schröder, B., Zehe, E., van Schaik,
508 L., 2018. Variability of earthworm-induced biopores and their hydrological
509 effectiveness in space and time. *Pedobiologia* 71, 8-19.

510 Schon, N.L., Malay, A.D., Gray, R.A., van Koten, C., Dodd, M.B., 2017. Influence of earthworm
511 abundance and diversity on soil structure and the implications for soil services
512 throughout the season. *Pedobiologia* 62, 41-47.

513 van Gestel, C.A.M., Koolhaas, J.E., Hamers, T., 2009. Effects of metal pollution on
514 earthworm communities in a contaminated floodplain area: linking biomarker,
515 community and functional responses. Environ. Pollut. 157, 895-903.

516 van Groenigen, J.W., van Groenigen, K.J., Koopmans, G.F., Stokkermans, L., Vos, H.M.J., Lubbers,
517 I.M., 2019. How fertile are earthworm casts? A meta-analysis. Geoderma 338, 525-535.

518 van Schaik, L., Palm, J., Klaus, J., Zehe, E., Schröder, B., 2014. Linking spatial earthworm
519 distribution to macropore numbers and hydrological effectiveness. Ecohydrology 7,
520 401-408.

521 Wang, Y., Tang, H., Matthew, C., Qiu, J., Li Y., 2019. Sodium absence modified burrowing
522 behavior of earthworm species *Metaphire californica* and *Eisenia fetida* in a farm soil.
523 Geoderma 335, 88-93.

524 Xu, T., Zhao, W., Miao, J.J., Zhang, B., Yang, X.Y., Sheng, G.D., Yin D.Q., 2020. A sensitive
525 optical-based test method for the locomotor activity of earthworms. Sci. Total
526 Environ. 715, 136966.

527 Yang, X., Shao, M.A., Li, T.C., Jia, Y.H., Jia, X.X., Huang, L.M., 2020. A preliminary investigation
528 of the effect of mole cricket (*Gryllotalpa unispina* Saussure; Orthoptera: Gryllotalpidae)

529 activity on soil evaporation in semiarid Loess Plateau of northwest China. *Geoderma*
530 363, 114144.

531 Zaller, J.G., Heigl, F., Ruess, L., Grabmeier, A., 2014. Glyphosate herbicide affects
532 belowground interactions between earthworms and symbiotic fungi in a model
533 ecosystem. *Scientific Report* 4, 5634.

534 Zorn, M.J., van Gestel, C.A.M., Eijsackers, H., 2005. The effects of *Lumbricus rubellus* and *Lumbricus*
535 *terrestris* on zinc distribution and availability in artificial soil columns. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*
536 41, 212-215.

537

538 **Captions for Figures**

539 **Fig. 1.** Examples of 3D burrow systems observed at different distances from the wall of a
540 lead recycling factory.



541 **Fig. 2.** Box and whisker plot of the volume of the burrow systems found in the soil cores
542 sampled at different distances from the wall of a lead recycling factory. Boxes bearing
543 different letters are different at the 5% threshold level (ANOVA).

544 **Fig. 3.** Box and whisker plot of the estimated diameter of the burrows found in the soil
545 cores sampled at different distances from the wall of a lead recycling factory. Boxes
546 bearing different letters are different at the 5% threshold level (ANOVA).



547 **Fig. 4.** Box and whisker plot of the continuity of the burrow system (assessed by the
548 number of burrows whose vertical length is larger than 6 cm) found in the soil cores
549 sampled at different distances from the wall of a lead recycling factory. Boxes bearing
550 different letters are different at the 5% threshold level (zero-inflated regression).

551 **Fig. 5.** Mean (and SE) infiltration rate, assessed in situ using the single ring method,
552 measured in soil cores sampled at different distances from the wall of a lead recycling
553 factory. Bars bearing different letters are different at the 5% threshold level (ANOVA).



10 m





30 m





50 m



80 m



110 m






Fig. 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5

Table 1. Abundance and biomass (means and SE) of anecic and endogeic earthworms and soil lead concentration and other key soil parameters in the fallow meadow in function of the distance to the factory wall (data taken from Lévêque et al. 2015).

	Distance to the factory (m)				
	10	30	50	80	110
ANECIC					
Abundance (m ⁻²)	0	4.19 (0.54)	11.43 (0.71)	40.53 (1.11)	72.78 (1.02)
Biomass (g m ⁻²)	0	10.42 (1.36)	23.15 (1.54)	71.18 (2.43)	126.34 (2.48)
ENDOGEIC					
Abundance (m ⁻²)	0	0	0.29 (0.07)	2.79 (0.24)	41.33 (2.61)
Biomass (g m ⁻²)	0	0	0.21 (0.03)	1.38 (0.54)	17.91 (1.15)
TOTAL					
Abundance (m ⁻²)	0	4.19 (0.54)	11.72 (0.74)	43.32 (1.26)	114.11 (2.94)
Biomass (g m ⁻²)	0	10.42 (1.36)	23.36 (1.54)	72.56 (2.44)	144.25 (2.57)
Percentage of anecic (% of total abundance)	-	100	98	94	64

Soil Pb concentration (mg kg ⁻¹)	29 600	3517	2350	1166	893
pH _{water}	7.9	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.2
C _{organic} (g kg ⁻¹)	37.9	24.0	25.4	21.3	22.5
N _{total} (g kg ⁻¹)	2.9	1.8	2.1	1.8	1.9

Table 2 Volumes (and percentage) of the burrow systems in 4 soil layers and total burrow number in function of the distance to the factory wall. Values bearing different letters are significantly different at the 5% threshold level (only burrow number was tested).

Volumes (cm ³) in the	Distance to the factory (m)				
	10	30	50	80	110
[0-3.75 cm] layer (and %)	9.44 (45.2%)	13.63 (61.0%)	9.95 (34.6%)	20.84 (40.8%)	16.55 (29.7%)
[3.25-7.5 cm] layer (and %)	4.86 (23.3%)	3.23 (14.5%)	6.50 (22.6%)	6.52 (22.1%)	12.76 (22.9%)
[7.5-11.25 cm] layer (and %)	2.63 (12.6%)	2.07 (9.2%)	6.51 (22.7%)	8.34 (16.3%)	13.48 (24.2%)
[11.25-15 cm] layer (and %)	3.96 (18.9%)	3.42 (15.3%)	5.76 (20.1%)	10.67 (20.9%)	12.98 (23.2%)
Number of burrows	127.8 ^{bc}	99.4 ^{bc}	82.0 ^c	143.3 ^b	281.8 ^c