

Tennessee State University

Digital Scholarship @ Tennessee State University

Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
Faculty Research

Department of Agricultural and Environmental
Sciences

6-30-2016

Costimulation of soil glycosidase activity and soil respiration by nitrogen addition

Ji Chen

Northwestern Polytechnical University

Yiqi Luo

University of Oklahoma

Jianwei Li

Tennessee State University

Xuhui Zhou

East China Normal University

Junji Cao

Chinese Academy of Sciences

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.tnstate.edu/agricultural-and-environmental-sciences-faculty>



Part of the [Soil Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chen, J., Luo, Y., Li, J., Zhou, X., Cao, J., Wang, R.-W., Wang, Y., Shelton, S., Jin, Z., Walker, L.M., Feng, Z., Niu, S., Feng, W., Jian, S. and Zhou, L. (2017), Costimulation of soil glycosidase activity and soil respiration by nitrogen addition. *Glob Change Biol*, 23: 1328-1337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13402>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences at Digital Scholarship @ Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship @ Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact XGE@Tnstate.edu.

Authors

Ji Chen, Yiqi Luo, Jianwei Li, Xuhui Zhou, Junji Cao, Rui-Wu Wang, Yunqiang Wang, Shelby Shelton, Zhao Jin, Laura M. Walker, Zhaozhong Feng, Shuli Niu, Wenting Feng, Siyang Jian, and Lingyan Zhou

1

2 Received Date : 30-Jul-2015

3 Accepted Date : 03-Jun-2016

4 Article type : Primary Research Articles

5

6

7 Co-stimulation of soil glycosidase activity and soil respiration by nitrogen addition

8

9 Running title: glycosidase activity and soil respiration

10

11 Ji Chen^{1,2,3,4}, Yiqi Luo^{4,5}, Jianwei Li^{6*}, Xuhui Zhou^{7,8}, Junji Cao^{1,9*}, Rui-Wu Wang^{1*},
12 Yunqiang Wang², Shelby Shelton⁴, Zhao Jin², Laura M. Walker¹⁰, Zhaozhong Feng¹¹,
13 Shuli Niu¹², Wenting Feng⁴, Siyang Jian⁶, and Lingyan Zhou⁷

14

15 ¹*Center for Ecological and Environmental Sciences, Northwestern Polytechnical*
16 *University, Xi'an 710072, China,* ²*State Key Laboratory of Loess and Quaternary*
17 *Geology (SKLLQG), and Key Laboratory of Aerosol Chemistry and Physics, Institute*
18 *of Earth Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xi'an 710061,*
19 *China;* ³*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049,*
20 *China;* ⁴*Department of Microbiology and Plant Biology, University of Oklahoma,*
21 *Norman, OK, 73019, USA;* ⁵*Center for Earth System Science, Tsinghua University,*
22 *Beijing, 100084, China;* ⁶*Department of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences,*
23 *Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN 37209, USA;* ⁷*Tiantong National Field*
24 *Observation Station for Forest Ecosystem, School of Ecological and Environmental*
25 *Sciences, East China Normal University, Shanghai, 200062, China;* ⁸*Center for*
26 *Global Change and Ecological Forecasting, East China Normal University, Shanghai,*
27 *200062, China;* ⁹*Institute of Global Environmental Change, Xi'an Jiaotong University,*

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/gcb.13402](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13402)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

28 Xi'an 710049, China; ¹⁰Department of Biological Sciences, University of Arkansas,
29 Fayetteville, AR, 72701, USA; ¹¹State Key Laboratory of Urban and Regional Ecology,
30 Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
31 Beijing, 100085, China; ¹²Synthesis Research Center of Chinese Ecosystem Research
32 Network, Key Laboratory of Ecosystem Network Observation and Modeling, Institute
33 of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of
34 Sciences, Beijing 100101, China.

35

36 *Corresponding author:

37 Junji Cao, cao@loess.llqg.ac.cn, Tel: +86-29-62336233, Fax: +86-29-62336234.

38 Jianwei Li, jli2@tncstate.edu, Tel: +1-615-963-1523, Fax: +1-615-963-1523.

39 Rui-Wu Wang, wangrw@nwpu.edu.cn, Tel: +86-29-88460816, Fax:

40 +86-29-88460816.

41 **Abstract**

42 Unprecedented levels of nitrogen (N) have been deposited in ecosystems over the past
43 century, which is expected to have cascading effects on microbially mediated soil
44 respiration (SR). Extracellular enzymes play critical roles on the degradation of soil
45 organic matter, and measurements of their activities are potentially useful indicators
46 of SR. The links between soil extracellular enzymatic activities (EEAs) and SR under
47 N addition, however, have not been established. We therefore conducted a
48 meta-analysis from 62 publications to synthesize the responses of soil EEAs and SR
49 to elevated N. Nitrogen addition significantly increased glycosidase activity (GA) by
50 13.0%, α -1,4-glucosidase (AG) by 19.6%, β -1,4-glucosidase (BG) by 11.1%,
51 β -1,4-xylosidase (BX) by 21.9% and β -D-cellobiosidase (CBH) by 12.6%. Increases
52 in GA were more evident for long duration, high rate, organic and mixed N addition
53 (combination of organic and inorganic N addition), as well as for studies from
54 farmland. The response ratios (RRs) of GA were positively correlated with the
55 SR-RRs, even when evaluated individually for AG, BG, BX and CBH. This positive
56 correlation between GA-RR and SR-RR was maintained for most types of vegetation
57 and soil as well as for different methods of N addition. Our results provide the first

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

58 evidence that GA is linked to SR under N addition over a range of ecosystems and
59 highlight the need for further studies on the response of other soil EEAs to various
60 global change factors and their implications for ecosystem functions.

61

62 **Keywords** Nitrogen addition, glycosidase activity, soil respiration, vegetation type,
63 soil type, meta-analysis

64 **Introduction**

65 Atmospheric nitrogen (N) deposition has already increased by three- to five-fold
66 compared to pre-industrial levels, and future global N deposition rates are expected to
67 increase by a factor of 2.5 over the next century (Davidson, 2009, Galloway *et al.*,
68 2008, Vitousek *et al.*, 1997). Additional N has been shown to stimulate plant growth
69 and sequestration of atmospheric CO₂ (LeBauer & Treseder, 2008, Maaroufi *et al.*,
70 2015). However, large uncertainties still remain concerning belowground C cycles,
71 since the dynamics of soil C are often mediated by many complicated processes, such
72 as soil microbial activities and extracellular enzymatic activities (EEAs) (Fog, 1988,
73 Knorr *et al.*, 2005, Lu *et al.*, 2011, Rousk *et al.*, 2016, Zhou *et al.*, 2014). More than
74 half of the C sequestered annually by terrestrial plants is ultimately allocated
75 belowground, and soils contain about four times as much C as vegetation biomass
76 (Chen *et al.*, 2015b, Vitousek *et al.*, 1997). Such large uncertainties concerning the
77 effects of N addition on belowground C cycles would therefore constitute important
78 challenges to quantifying and predicting the dynamics of terrestrial C, especially
79 under the current scenarios of global climate change (Gruber & Galloway, 2008,
80 Thomas *et al.*, 2015, Thornton *et al.*, 2007). To advance our understanding of
81 C-climate feedbacks, more information of N regulation of terrestrial C dynamics is
82 urgently needed.

83 Soil respiration (SR) represents the largest flux of C from soils to the atmosphere
84 (Chen *et al.*, 2016a, Zhou *et al.*, 2007), but the effects of N addition on SR vary
85 greatly for results from field observations (Eberwein *et al.*, 2015, Liu *et al.*, 2015),
86 models (Devaraju *et al.*, 2015, Magnani *et al.*, 2007) and meta-analyses (Janssens *et*
87 *al.*, 2010, Liu & Greaver, 2010, Lu *et al.*, 2011, Zhou *et al.*, 2014). The underlying

88 mechanisms for these divergent responses remain largely unclear. Whatever the exact
89 mechanisms, changes in microbial enzymatic activities are likely the fundamental
90 drivers of the response of SR to N addition since more than half of SR is derived from
91 enzyme-mediated decomposition of litter and soil organic matter (SOM) (Allison *et*
92 *al.*, 2010b, Carreiro *et al.*, 2000, Chen *et al.*, 2016b, Shahzad *et al.*, 2015, Waldrop *et*
93 *al.*, 2004). It is therefore likely that understanding how soil EEAs respond to N
94 addition could provide novel ways to reconcile the divergent responses of SR to N
95 addition (Allison *et al.*, 2008, Stone *et al.*, 2014, Weedon *et al.*, 2011), a concept also
96 suggested by several recent reviews (Fog, 1988, Janssens *et al.*, 2010, Knorr *et al.*,
97 2005). Evidence from recent enzymatic kinetics-based modeling efforts also
98 supported that inclusion of soil EEAs into models have greatly improved the estimates
99 of SR and C-climate feedbacks (Ali *et al.*, 2015, Allison *et al.*, 2010b). Therefore, it is
100 clear that our understanding of the effects of N addition on SR will greatly benefit
101 from the study of soil EEAs.

102 Soil EEAs are commonly regarded as potential indicators of microbial nutrient
103 requirements and depolymerization rates of SOM, yet their activities largely depend
104 upon nutrient availability (Sinsabaugh *et al.*, 2008, Treseder, 2004, Waldrop *et al.*,
105 2004). Nitrogen limitation is widespread in terrestrial ecosystems (LeBauer &
106 Treseder, 2008), soil microorganisms and soil EEAs are therefore highly sensitive to
107 increased levels of N (Allison *et al.*, 2008, Treseder, 2008). The effects of N addition
108 on soil EEAs, however, are highly variable between individual studies (Currey *et al.*,
109 2010, Cusack *et al.*, 2010), which have greatly hindered our understanding of the
110 possible mechanisms driving the response of soil EEAs following N addition. It has
111 been reported that soil EEAs responded positively to N addition in farmland and
112 grassland (Nowinski *et al.*, 2009, Zeglin *et al.*, 2007), but the responses were neutral
113 or negative in temperate and boreal forests (Allison *et al.*, 2010a, Janssens *et al.*,
114 2010). The lack of consistency suggests the importance of evaluating the effects of N
115 addition on EEAs and SR in specific types of ecosystems (Schmidt *et al.*, 2011).
116 Addition of organic or combination of organic and inorganic N (mixed N addition)
117 generally had positive effects on soil EEAs, while NH_4^+ or NO_3^- addition had

118 negative impacts (Du *et al.*, 2014, Li *et al.*, 2014b). It stands to reason that the forms
119 of added N should be reflected in soil N availability or pH, and that each of these
120 effects should influence soil EEAs and SR (Sinsabaugh *et al.*, 2008). Therefore, it is
121 critically necessary to synthesize results from a variety of studies to accurately
122 characterize the principle effects of N addition on soil EEAs and their possible
123 impacts on SR.

124 We conducted a meta-analysis on the responses of soil EEAs and SR to N
125 addition. Our goal was to focus more broadly on the links between soil EEAs and SR
126 rather than evaluating them separately. The objectives of this study were (1) to test
127 whether the response of SR to N addition could be linked to the responses of soil
128 EEAs, (2) and if so, to investigate the responses of these EEAs to the additional N in
129 various types of ecosystems and the different methods of N addition and (3) to further
130 explore the factors affecting the possible links between soil EEAs and SR, such as
131 substrate N availability and pH.

132

133 **Materials and methods**

134 **Sources of data**

135 We searched journal articles published before October 2015 using the Web of Science
136 (<http://apps.webofknowledge.com/>). The keywords and phrases used for the literature
137 search were (1) “nitrogen deposition” OR “nitrogen addition” OR “nitrogen
138 enrichment” OR “nitrogen fertilizer” OR “nitrogen amendment” OR “nitrogen
139 elevated”, AND (2) “soil extracellular enzymes”, AND (3) “terrestrial” OR “soil” OR
140 “land”.

141 Articles were selected based on the following criteria. (1) Only field experiments
142 were included, and we selected only studies with durations longer than 1 y. Control
143 and N-addition treatments had to be at the same experimental site, i.e. the
144 microclimate and vegetation and soil types had to be similar between treatments. (2)
145 Standard deviations (SDs) and numbers of replicates were reported. If standard errors
146 (SEs) were reported, the following equation was used to estimate SDs:

147 $SD = SE \times \sqrt{n}$ (1),

148 where n is the number of replicates. (3) The methods of N addition (rate, frequency,
149 form and duration) were clearly described. (4) If more than one field manipulation
150 experiment was reported in the same article but for different environmental variables
151 or types of ecosystem (e.g. experiments conducted under various types of vegetation
152 and soil), each experiment was treated as an independent study. (5) If parameters were
153 measured more than once in the same year, we chose only the last set of
154 measurements. (6) If the results were reported for different soil layers, we included
155 only the uppermost soil layer (García-Palacios *et al.*, 2014). We selected a total of 62
156 publications based on these criteria (Supplementary Notes (iii) and Fig. S1).

157

158 **Data acquisition**

159 For each of the selected studies, we recorded the study site, location, vegetation type,
160 soil type (<http://www.fao.org/about/en/>), N-addition rate (low < 5 g N m⁻² y⁻¹, medium
161 5–15 g N m⁻² y⁻¹ and high > 15 g N m⁻² y⁻¹), N addition duration (short < 5 y, medium
162 5–10 y and long >10 y), N-addition frequency (low < 4 y⁻¹, medium 4–12 y⁻¹ and
163 high > 12 y⁻¹), N-addition form (NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻, NH₄NO₃, organic N or mixed N) and
164 soil EEAs. Wherever possible, we also recorded SR, soil pH, soil total N, soil
165 dissolved organic N (DON), substrate C: N ratios and aboveground biomass. We
166 defined SR as the amount of soil CO₂ measured by soil chambers in the field studies
167 or during laboratory incubations (Chen *et al.*, 2015a, Treseder, 2008). If the results
168 were presented graphically, we used Engauge Digitizer 4.1
169 (<http://digitizer.sourceforge.net>) to digitize and extract the data. The authors were
170 contacted when critical information could not be directly acquired from the selected
171 articles or their references.

172

173 **Data analysis**

174 The effects of N addition were evaluated using the response ratio (RR), which was
175 calculated as:

176
$$RR = \ln\left(\frac{\overline{X}_N}{\overline{X}_C}\right) = \ln(\overline{X}_N) - \ln(\overline{X}_C) \quad (2),$$

177 where \overline{X}_N and \overline{X}_C are the arithmetic mean concentrations of the soil EEAs in the
 178 experimental (N addition) and control treatments, respectively. The statistical
 179 distribution of the RRs calculated in this way was found to be nearly normally
 180 distributed, and only minor biases were detected (Hedges *et al.*, 1999). The variances
 181 (v) were calculated by:

182
$$v = \frac{s_N^2}{n_N \overline{X}_N^2} + \frac{s_C^2}{n_C \overline{X}_C^2} \quad (3),$$

183 where n_N and n_C are the replicate numbers of experimental and control treatments,
 184 respectively, and S_N and S_C are the SDs for the experimental and control treatments,
 185 respectively. The reciprocal of the variance was used as the weight (w) for each RR.
 186 The overall mean response ratio (RR_{++}) was calculated from the individual RRs for
 187 the experimental and control treatments:

188
$$RR_{++} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k w_{ij} RR_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k w_{ij}} \quad (4),$$

189 where m is the number of compared groups and k is the number of comparisons in
 190 the corresponding groups. The SE of RR_{++} was estimated by:

191
$$SE(RR_{++}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k w_{ij}}} \quad (5).$$

192 To determine whether N addition had a significant effect, we applied a random model
 193 using MetaWin (Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, USA), in which bootstrap 95%
 194 confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for each categorical group. The effect of a
 195 treatment was deemed significant if the bootstrap CI did not overlap with zero.

196 Changes induced by N addition were calculated by:

197
$$[\exp(RR_{++}) - 1] \times 100\% \quad (6).$$

198 Pearson correlation analyses were used to evaluate the relationships between the RRs
 199 for the soil EEAs and (1) environmental variables, (2) N-addition methods and (3)
 200 substrate N concentrations.

201 The total heterogeneity (Q_T) for each categorical group was divided into
202 heterogeneities among groups (Q_M) and between groups (Q_B). The chi-square
203 distribution for these Q statistics was approximately normal in previous studies (Liu
204 & Greaver, 2009, Treseder, 2008), which allowed us to test our null hypothesis that all
205 RRs were equal within a categorical group. The statistical confidence level was set at
206 $p < 0.05$.

207 The frequency distribution of the individual RRs of each enzyme was tested by:

$$208 \quad y = \alpha \exp \left[-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \quad (7),$$

209 where y is the frequency, x is the RR of each enzyme, α is a coefficient for the
210 expected number of RR values at $x = \mu$, and μ and σ are the mean and variance of
211 the frequency distributions of RR, respectively. The frequency distributions are shown
212 in Fig. S2.

213 Due to the preferential publication of larger over smaller effects, we used a series
214 of statistical measures to evaluate publication bias within each group (Table S1).
215 Kendall's tau rank correlation and Spearman's rank correlation were used to test the
216 rank correlations between replicate numbers of each study and the standardized effect
217 size (Begg, 1994, Rosenberg *et al.*, 2000). A fail-safe number (Rosenthal's method at
218 $\alpha = 0.05$) was next calculated to determine the number of non-significant, unpublished
219 studies that would be needed to change the summary of results from significant to
220 non-significant (LeBauer & Treseder, 2008, Rosenthal, 1979).

221

222 **Results**

223 *Effects of N addition on glycosidase activity and SR*

224 Our preliminary analysis of 12 kinds of soil extracellular enzymes showed that
225 SR-RRs were only positively correlated with RRs for α -1,4-glucosidase (AG),
226 β -1,4-glucosidase (BG), β -1,4-xylosidase (BX) and β -D-cellobiosidase (CBH)
227 activities (Table S2 and Fig. S3), but no correlation was found for the other 8 kinds of
228 EEAs. In addition, there was no between-group heterogeneity among the four kinds of
229 glycosidase and RRs for glycosidase activity (GA-RRs) did not vary with sample size

230 (Figs. 1 and S4). We therefore focused on the responses of GA to N addition and the
231 factors affecting the relationships between the SR-RRs and GA-RRs.

232 Nitrogen addition significantly increased GA by an average of 13.0% (Fig. 1). In
233 detail, N addition profoundly enhanced AG, BG, BX and CBH activities by 19.6, 11.1,
234 21.9 and 12.6%, respectively. GA-RRs were positively correlated with SR-RRs (Fig.
235 1), and this relationship was independent of SR measurement methods (Fig. S5).

236

237 *Methods of N addition*

238 NH_4NO_3 , organic and mixed N addition significantly increased GA by 13.2, 18.8 and
239 16.5%, respectively, but the addition of NH_4^+ or NO_3^- had no effects on GA (Fig. 2).
240 Positive correlations between GA-RRs and SR-RRs were consistently identified when
241 N was added as NH_4NO_3 , organic or mixed forms (Fig. 3).

242 We found a significant positive linear relationship between GA-RRs and duration
243 of N addition (Fig. S4). Specifically, short, medium and long durations of N addition
244 significantly increased GA by 6.5, 11.2 and 46.6%, respectively (Fig. 2). Similarly,
245 the positive correlations between GA-RRs and SR-RRs were maintained for all
246 durations of N addition (Fig. 3).

247 Low, medium and high rates of N addition increased GA by 8.0, 11.7 and 20.8%,
248 respectively (Fig. 2), and GA-RRs were positively correlated with N-addition rates
249 (Fig. S4). The positive correlations between GA-RRs and SR-RRs held true for
250 medium and high rates but not for a low rate of N addition (Fig. 3).

251 Low, medium and high frequencies of N addition increased GA by 13.2, 15.0 and
252 1.6%, respectively. No between-group heterogeneity was found when studies were
253 grouped by the frequency of N addition, and no clear relationship was detected
254 between GA-RRs and frequency of N addition (Figs. 2 and S4). GA-RRs were
255 positively correlated with SR-RRs for low and medium frequencies of N addition, but
256 this analysis was limited by the paucity of data for treatments with a high frequency
257 of N addition (Fig. 3).

258

259 *Vegetation and soil types*

260 The responses of GA to N addition varied significantly among the types of vegetation
261 and soil (Fig. 4). Nitrogen addition significantly increased GA by 34.7, 6.4, 5.5 and
262 19.9% for farmland, forest, grassland and shrubland, respectively, but N addition had
263 no effect on GA in wetland. GA-RRs were positively correlated with SR-RRs for
264 grassland and farmland but not for forest (Fig. 5). No SR data were available for
265 wetland and shrubland, so we could not evaluate the links between GA and SR for
266 those systems.

267 Nitrogen addition significantly increased GA in Chernozems, Cambisols,
268 Gleysols, Entisols, Histosols, Podzols, Lithosols and Luvisols by 38.4, 13.8, 46.4, 8.6,
269 17.5, 10.2, 15.7 and 27.2%, respectively. In contrast, N addition decreased GA by 5.2%
270 in Ferralsols and had no effects on GA in Solonchaks and Arenosols (Fig. 4).
271 Significant positive relationships between the GA-RRs and SR-RRs were found for
272 Cambisols and Luvisols, but the relationship was negative for Podzols (Fig. 5). The
273 small numbers of studies of Solonchaks, Entisols and Ferralsols, however, limited the
274 statistical power of the analysis.

275

276 **Discussion**

277 This meta-analysis is among the first global syntheses of the effects of N addition on
278 soil EEAs and their impacts on SR. The objectives herein go beyond separate
279 assessments of soil EEAs and SR; rather, we address the broader question of whether
280 the effects of N addition on soil EEAs can help to explain the enhanced SR reported
281 in previous meta-analyses (Fig. S6) (Lu *et al.*, 2011, Zhou *et al.*, 2014). Our results
282 show that SR-RRs are closely correlated with GA-RRs, and this correlation still holds
283 true when evaluated for most types of vegetation and soil, as well as for different
284 methods of N addition. These results suggest that the effects of N addition on four
285 kinds of glycosidase are likely the effective proximate agents of the effects of N
286 addition on SR (Fig. 1). But, what is the basis for linking the four kinds of glycosidase
287 with SR under N addition? Preliminary analysis of 12 kinds of soil EEAs that were
288 frequently investigated in previous studies (Table S2), indicate that only the RR for
289 AG, BG, BX and CBH are closely correlated with SR-RRs (Fig. S3). These four kinds

290 of glycosidase are all classified as hydrolysis C-targeting enzymes. Our results
291 suggest that shifts in the activities of various kinds of soil extracellular enzymes likely
292 account for the highly divergent responses of SR to N addition.

293

294 ***Co-stimulation of GA and SR by N addition***

295 Nitrogen addition significantly increased GA, and the stimulatory effects were
296 positively correlated with SR-RRs (Fig. 1). The added N not only provides the
297 building blocks for enzymatic production because enzymes are fundamentally N-rich
298 molecules, but it also increases microbial C demands due to stoichiometry of
299 microbial nutrients (Allison *et al.*, 2008, Sistla & Schimel, 2013, Weedon *et al.*, 2011).
300 Increases in microbial C demands were expected to be alleviated by promoting the
301 activities of C-degrading enzymes (Buchkowski *et al.*, 2015). This expectation is
302 consistent with the typical economic strategy in which soil microbes would adjust
303 themselves in physiology or community composition in order to produce enzymes
304 needed for acquiring the most limited resources (Sinsabaugh *et al.*, 2008, Stone *et al.*,
305 2012). Despite the fact that various kinds of C-degrading enzymes that can contribute
306 to alleviating microbial C demands, N addition had negative effects on the oxidative
307 lignin-degrading enzymes (Fig. S7). Therefore, C requirements of microbes may be
308 mainly fulfilled by synthesizing glycosidase (Fig. 1), which would accelerate the
309 hydrolysis of cellulolytic compounds.

310

311 ***Factors that affect the relationships between GA and SR***

312 Higher substrate N concentrations lead to a more pronounced positive response of GA
313 (Fig. S10), suggesting that high N availability enhances microbial C demands
314 (Nguyen *et al.*, 2016, Treseder, 2008). Longer durations and higher rates of N addition
315 can produce high and stable N concentrations (Bragazza *et al.*, 2012), so the positive
316 responses of GA and the steeper slopes between GA-RRs and SR-RRs under these
317 two conditions were not surprising (Figs. 2 and S4). In farmland, N is often added at
318 high rates through anthropogenic fertilization (Chang *et al.*, 2007, McDaniel *et al.*,
319 2014). Cambisols and Luvisols are among the most productive soils on Earth, and

320 these soils make good agricultural lands given their high soil fertility (i.e. N content).
321 Consistently, we also observed positive responses of GA and positive correlations
322 between GA-RRs and SR-RRs in these systems (Figs. 4 and 5).

323 We found a more pronounced increase for GA in farmland (34.7%) than the other
324 types of vegetation and soil (Fig. 2). In addition to the higher N rates discussed above,
325 another possible explanation might be related to the forms of N addition, because 92%
326 of the added N in farmland was in organic or mixed N forms (Table S3). Organic and
327 mixed N must be transformed or converted by enzymes and so they had positive
328 effects on GA and SR (Figs. 2 and 3) (Ajwa *et al.*, 1999, Hawkins *et al.*, 2000).
329 Considering the current ongoing intensified anthropogenic fertilization with organic
330 and mixed N (McDaniel *et al.*, 2014), our results indicate that there might be a
331 stronger positive response of SR in farmland under future N fertilization.

332 We did not find significant responses of GA for Ferralsols, Solonchaks,
333 Arenosols and wetlands. These types of soils have relatively low pHs due to the high
334 concentrations of iron and aluminum (Chesworth, 2008). Soil nutrient availability and
335 microbial activities may thus be constrained by the low pH or possibly other chemical
336 properties (Evans *et al.*, 2008, Tian & Niu, 2015). This explanation was supported by
337 our regression analysis which indicates that GA-RRs are closely correlated with soil
338 pH (Fig. S11). A comprehensive assessment of the relationships between GA-RRs and
339 SR-RRs under these conditions are currently not feasible due to the small data set, but
340 other studies have shown that N addition had negative or no effects on SR under these
341 conditions (Tao *et al.*, 2013, Wang *et al.*, 2013, Zhou *et al.*, 2014). Our results suggest
342 that soil pH should be considered when implementing GA-RRs as the proximate
343 agents of SR-RRs.

344 GA-RRs were not correlated with SR-RRs for forests, Podzols or low rates of N
345 addition, even though GA did respond positively to N addition in these cases (Figs.
346 2-5). This finding for forests was consistent with two recent meta-analyses indicating
347 that N addition repressed SR (Janssens *et al.*, 2010, Zhou *et al.*, 2014), perhaps
348 because degradation of the low-quality forest litter responded negatively to the
349 additional N (Fog, 1988, Knorr *et al.*, 2005). Podzols are typical in coniferous and

350 temperate forests, and most podzols are not suitable for agriculture due to their low
351 water-retention capacity and low pH (Chesworth, 2008). These two characteristics of
352 Podzols were likely responsible for the negative effects of N addition on SR. The lack
353 of correlation between GA-RRs and SR-RRs with a low rate of N addition may be
354 due in part to undetectable effects caused by the small amount of additional N
355 (Bowden *et al.*, 2004, Knorr *et al.*, 2005). These results would therefore provide
356 valuable information for Earth system models when models are to be applied to
357 various ecosystem types.

358

359 ***Uncertainties and implications***

360 The GA-RRs were on average 2.5 times higher than SR-RRs (Fig. 1), suggesting that
361 N-induced changes in SR might not be the direct result of changes in microbial
362 growth. Assuming that enzyme expression is directly related to production rate, these
363 results imply that N addition increases microbial carbon-use efficiency (CUE)
364 (Allison *et al.*, 2010b). Alternatively, microbial growth and death rates could respond
365 differentially to the elevated N (Hagerty *et al.*, 2014, Treseder, 2008). Nonetheless,
366 the responses of microbial CUE and growth and death rates to N addition are
367 currently unclear. Major limitations also may stem from the paucity of data for the
368 various types of vegetation and soil, such as those in arid and semiarid regions and
369 wetlands (Table S3). Future field experiments should be conducted with a wide range
370 of variables to clarify the underlying principles.

371 The highly consistent responses of GA and SR to N addition identified here,
372 support the utility of explicitly incorporating microbial activities and soil EEAs into
373 models for predicting the dynamics of soil C under various global change scenarios
374 (Allison *et al.*, 2010b, Wieder *et al.*, 2013). Actually, several recent modeling efforts
375 have confirmed that incorporation of soil EEAs into enzymatic-kinetics models have
376 substantially improved the projection of both the direction and magnitude of
377 C-climate feedbacks (Ali *et al.*, 2015, Allison *et al.*, 2010b, Li *et al.*, 2014a, Xu *et al.*,
378 2014). Our results also have important implications for other global change factors,
379 for example, climatic warming. Warming has globally increased substrate N

380 concentrations, aboveground biomass, SR (Bai *et al.*, 2013, Lu *et al.*, 2013), and it is
381 likely that warming will also lead to increases in GA, as discussed above. This
382 extrapolation seems reasonable, but we are well aware that ecosystems are often
383 highly heterogeneous and may respond in unexpected ways to environmental changes.
384 Our meta-analysis is a first attempt at linking GA to SR under N addition, and future
385 studies are clearly needed to determine how other soil EEAs and associated ecosystem
386 functions respond to various global change factors.

387

388 **Acknowledgements** This study was supported by the Ministry of Science and
389 Technology (2012BAH31B03) and the State Key Laboratory of Loess and Quaternary
390 Geology, Institute of Earth Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences
391 (SKLLQG1303). Contributions from Dr. Luo's Eco-lab to this study were financially
392 supported by Terrestrial Ecosystem Sciences grant DE SC0008270 from the U.S.
393 Department of Energy and by the US National Science Foundation grants DBI
394 0850290, EPS0919466, DEB 0743778, DEB 0840964 and EF 1137293. Contributions
395 from Dr. Jianwei Li's laboratory were financially supported by USDA National
396 Institute of Food and Agriculture - Evans-Allen project No. 1005761. Contributions
397 from Dr. Xuhui Zhou's laboratory were financially supported by the National Natural
398 Science Foundation of China (31290221, 31070407 and 31370489), the National
399 Basic Research Program (973 Program) of China (No. 2010CB833502), the Program
400 for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of
401 Higher Learning and the 'Thousand Young Talents' Program in China. The authors
402 also gratefully acknowledge financial support from the China Scholarship Council (an
403 award for one year of study abroad at the University of Oklahoma).

404

405 Competing financial interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests

406 References

407 Ajwa H, Dell C, Rice C (1999) Changes in enzyme activities and microbial biomass of tallgrass prairie
408 soil as related to burning and nitrogen fertilization. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **31**,
409 769-777.

410 Ali RS, Ingwersen J, Demyan MS, Funkuin YN, Wizemann H-D, Kandeler E, Poll C (2015) Modelling in
411 situ activities of enzymes as a tool to explain seasonal variation of soil respiration from
412 agro-ecosystems. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **81**, 291-303.

413 Allison SD, Czimczik CI, Treseder KK (2008) Microbial activity and soil respiration under nitrogen
414 addition in Alaskan boreal forest. *Global Change Biology*, **14**, 1156-1168.

415 Allison SD, Gartner TB, Mack MC, McGuire K, Treseder K (2010a) Nitrogen alters carbon dynamics
416 during early succession in boreal forest. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, **42**, 1157-1164.

417 Allison SD, Wallenstein MD, Bradford MA (2010b) Soil-carbon response to warming dependent on
418 microbial physiology. *Nature Geoscience*, **3**, 336-340.

419 Bai E, Li S, Xu W, Li W, Dai W, Jiang P (2013) A meta - analysis of experimental warming effects on
420 terrestrial nitrogen pools and dynamics. *New Phytologist*, **199**, 441-451.

421 Begg CB (1994) Publication bias. *The handbook of research synthesis*, **25**, 299-409.

422 Bowden RD, Davidson E, Savage K, Arabia C, Steudler P (2004) Chronic nitrogen additions reduce total
423 soil respiration and microbial respiration in temperate forest soils at the Harvard Forest.
424 *Forest Ecology and Management*, **196**, 43-56.

425 Bragazza L, Buttler A, Habermacher J *et al.* (2012) High nitrogen deposition alters the decomposition
426 of bog plant litter and reduces carbon accumulation. *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 1163-1172.

427 Buchkowski RW, Schmitz OJ, Bradford MA (2015) Microbial stoichiometry overrides biomass as a
428 regulator of soil carbon and nitrogen cycling. *Ecology*, **96**, 1139-1149.

429 Carreiro M, Sinsabaugh R, Repert D, Parkhurst D (2000) Microbial enzyme shifts explain litter decay
430 responses to simulated nitrogen deposition. *Ecology*, **81**, 2359-2365.

431 Chang E-H, Chung R-S, Tsai Y-H (2007) Effect of different application rates of organic fertilizer on soil
432 enzyme activity and microbial population. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, **53**, 132-140.

433 Chen J, Luo Y, Xia J *et al.* (2015a) Stronger warming effects on microbial abundances in colder regions.
434 *Scientific Reports*, **5**. doi: 10.1038/srep18032.

435 Chen J, Shi W, Cao J (2015b) Effects of Grazing on Ecosystem CO₂ Exchange in a Meadow Grassland on
436 the Tibetan Plateau During the Growing Season. *Environmental management*, **55**, 347-359.

437 Chen J, Luo Y, Xia J *et al.* (2016a) Differential responses of ecosystem respiration components to
438 experimental warming in a meadow grassland on the Tibetan Plateau. *Agricultural and Forest
439 Meteorology*, **220**, 21-29.

- 440 Chen J, Zhou X, Wang J *et al.* (2016b) Grazing exclusion reduced soil respiration but increased its
441 temperature sensitivity in a Meadow Grassland on the Tibetan Plateau. *Ecology and Evolution*,
442 **6**, 675-687.
- 443 Chesworth W (2008) *Encyclopedia of soil science*. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- 444 Currey PM, Johnson D, Sheppard LJ *et al.* (2010) Turnover of labile and recalcitrant soil carbon differ in
445 response to nitrate and ammonium deposition in an ombrotrophic peatland. *Global Change*
446 *Biology*, **16**, 2307-2321.
- 447 Cusack DF, Torn MS, McDowell WH, Silver WL (2010) The response of heterotrophic activity and
448 carbon cycling to nitrogen additions and warming in two tropical soils. *Global Change Biology*,
449 **16**, 2555-2572.
- 450 Davidson EA (2009) The contribution of manure and fertilizer nitrogen to atmospheric nitrous oxide
451 since 1860. *Nature Geoscience*, **2**, 659-662.
- 452 Devaraju N, Bala G, Caldeira K, Nemani R (2015) A model based investigation of the relative
453 importance of CO₂-fertilization, climate warming, nitrogen deposition and land use change
454 on the global terrestrial carbon uptake in the historical period. *Climate Dynamics*, 1-18. doi:
455 10.1007/s00382-015-2830-8.
- 456 Du YH, Guo P, Liu JQ, Wang CY, Yang N, Jiao ZX (2014) Different types of nitrogen deposition show
457 variable effects on the soil carbon cycle process of temperate forests. *Global Change Biology*,
458 **20**, 3222-3228.
- 459 Eberwein J, Oikawa P, Allsman L, Jenerette G (2015) Carbon availability regulates soil respiration
460 response to nitrogen and temperature. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **88**, 158-164.
- 461 Evans CD, Goodale CL, Caporn SJ *et al.* (2008) Does elevated nitrogen deposition or ecosystem
462 recovery from acidification drive increased dissolved organic carbon loss from upland soil? A
463 review of evidence from field nitrogen addition experiments. *Biogeochemistry*, **91**, 13-35.
- 464 Fog K (1988) The effect of added nitrogen on the rate of decomposition of organic matter. *Biological*
465 *Reviews*, **63**, 433-462.
- 466 Galloway JN, Townsend AR, Erisman JW *et al.* (2008) Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent
467 trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science*, **320**, 889-892.
- 468 García-Palacios P, Vandegehuchte ML, Ashley Shaw E *et al.* (2014) Are there links between responses
469 of soil microbes and ecosystem functioning to elevated CO₂, N deposition and warming? A

470 global perspective. *Global Change Biology*, **21**, 1590-1600.

471 Gruber N, Galloway JN (2008) An Earth-system perspective of the global nitrogen cycle. *Nature*, **451**,
472 293-296.

473 Hagerty SB, Van Groenigen KJ, Allison SD *et al.* (2014) Accelerated microbial turnover but constant
474 growth efficiency with warming in soil. *Nature Climate Change*, **4**, 903-906.

475 Hawkins H-J, Johansen A, George E (2000) Uptake and transport of organic and inorganic nitrogen by
476 arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Plant and Soil*, **226**, 275-285.

477 Hedges LV, Gurevitch J, Curtis PS (1999) The meta-analysis of response ratios in experimental ecology.
478 *Ecology*, **80**, 1150-1156.

479 Janssens I, Dieleman W, Luysaert S *et al.* (2010) Reduction of forest soil respiration in response to
480 nitrogen deposition. *Nature Geoscience*, **3**, 315-322.

481 Knorr M, Frey S, Curtis P (2005) Nitrogen additions and litter decomposition: a meta-analysis. *Ecology*,
482 **86**, 3252-3257.

483 Lebauer DS, Treseder KK (2008) Nitrogen limitation of net primary productivity in terrestrial
484 ecosystems is globally distributed. *Ecology*, **89**, 371-379.

485 Li J, Wang G, Allison SD, Mayes MA, Luo Y (2014a) Soil carbon sensitivity to temperature and carbon
486 use efficiency compared across microbial-ecosystem models of varying complexity.
487 *Biogeochemistry*, **119**, 67-84.

488 Li SS, Du YH, Guo P, Guo LD, Qu KY, He JP (2014b) Effects of different types of N deposition on the
489 fungal decomposition activities of temperate forest soils. *Science of the Total Environment*,
490 **497**, 91-96.

491 Liu L, Greaver TL (2009) A review of nitrogen enrichment effects on three biogenic GHGs: the CO₂ sink
492 may be largely offset by stimulated N₂O and CH₄ emission. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 1103-1117.

493 Liu L, Greaver TL (2010) A global perspective on belowground carbon dynamics under nitrogen
494 enrichment. *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 819-828.

495 Liu L, Hu C, Yang P, Ju Z, Olesen JE, Tang J (2015) Effects of experimental warming and nitrogen
496 addition on soil respiration and CH₄ fluxes from crop rotations of winter
497 wheat–soybean/fallow. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **207**, 38-47.

498 Lu M, Zhou X, Luo Y, Yang Y, Fang C, Chen J, Li B (2011) Minor stimulation of soil carbon storage by
499 nitrogen addition: a meta-analysis. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, **140**, 234-244.

- 500 Lu M, Zhou X, Yang Q *et al.* (2013) Responses of ecosystem carbon cycle to experimental warming: a
501 meta-analysis. *Ecology*, **94**, 726-738.
- 502 Maaroufi NI, Nordin A, Hasselquist NJ, Bach LH, Palmqvist K, Gundale MJ (2015) Anthropogenic
503 nitrogen deposition enhances carbon sequestration in boreal soils. *Global Change Biology*, **21**,
504 3169-3180.
- 505 Magnani F, Mencuccini M, Borghetti M *et al.* (2007) The human footprint in the carbon cycle of
506 temperate and boreal forests. *Nature*, **447**, 849-851.
- 507 Mcdaniel MD, Grandy AS, Tiemann LK, Weintraub MN (2014) Crop rotation complexity regulates the
508 decomposition of high and low quality residues. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **78**, 243-254.
- 509 Nguyen TT, Cavagnaro TR, Ngo HTT, Marschner P (2016) Soil respiration, microbial biomass and
510 nutrient availability in soil amended with high and low C/N residue—Influence of interval
511 between residue additions. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **95**, 189-197.
- 512 Nowinski NS, Trumbore SE, Jimenez G, Fenn ME (2009) Alteration of belowground carbon dynamics by
513 nitrogen addition in southern California mixed conifer forests. *Journal of Geophysical*
514 *Research-Biogeosciences*, **114**. doi: 10.1029/2008jg000801.
- 515 Rosenberg MS, Adams DC, Gurevitch J (2000) MetaWin: Statistical Software for MetaAnalysis. Version
516 2.0. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland.
- 517 Rosenthal R (1979) The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological bulletin*, **86**,
518 638. doi: org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638.
- 519 Rousk K, Michelsen A, Rousk J (2016) Microbial control of soil organic matter mineralization responses
520 to labile carbon in subarctic climate change treatments. *Global Change Biology*. doi:
521 10.1111/gcb.13296.
- 522 Schmidt MW, Torn MS, Abiven S *et al.* (2011) Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem
523 property. *Nature*, **478**, 49-56.
- 524 Shahzad T, Chenu C, Genet P, Barot S, Perveen N, Mougin C, Fontaine S (2015) Contribution of
525 exudates, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and litter depositions to the rhizosphere priming
526 effect induced by grassland species. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **80**, 146-155.
- 527 Sinsabaugh RL, Lauber CL, Weintraub MN *et al.* (2008) Stoichiometry of soil enzyme activity at global
528 scale. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 1252-1264.
- 529 Sistla SA, Schimel JP (2013) Seasonal patterns of microbial extracellular enzyme activities in an arctic

530 tundra soil: identifying direct and indirect effects of long-term summer warming. *Soil Biology*
531 *and Biochemistry*, **66**, 119-129.

532 Stone M, Deforest J, Plante A (2014) Changes in extracellular enzyme activity and microbial
533 community structure with soil depth at the Luquillo Critical Zone Observatory. *Soil Biology*
534 *and Biochemistry*, **75**, 237-247.

535 Stone MM, Weiss MS, Goodale CL, Adams MB, Fernandez IJ, German DP, Allison SD (2012)
536 Temperature sensitivity of soil enzyme kinetics under N-fertilization in two temperate forests.
537 *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 1173-1184.

538 Tao B, Song C, Guo Y (2013) Short-term effects of nitrogen additions and increased temperature on
539 wetland soil respiration, Sanjiang Plain, China. *Wetlands*, **33**, 727-736.

540 Thomas RQ, Brookshire E, Gerber S (2015) Nitrogen limitation on land: how can it occur in Earth
541 system models? *Global Change Biology*, **21**, 1777-1793.

542 Thornton PE, Lamarque JF, Rosenbloom NA, Mahowald NM (2007) Influence of carbon - nitrogen
543 cycle coupling on land model response to CO₂ fertilization and climate variability. *Global*
544 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, **21**. doi: 10.1029/2006GB002868.

545 Tian D, Niu S (2015) A global analysis of soil acidification caused by nitrogen addition. *Environmental*
546 *Research Letters*, **10**, 024019.

547 Treseder KK (2004) A meta - analysis of mycorrhizal responses to nitrogen, phosphorus, and
548 atmospheric CO₂ in field studies. *New Phytologist*, **164**, 347-355.

549 Treseder KK (2008) Nitrogen additions and microbial biomass: a meta-analysis of ecosystem studies.
550 *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 1111-1120.

551 Vitousek PM, Aber JD, Howarth RW *et al.* (1997) Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle:
552 sources and consequences. *Ecological Applications*, **7**, 737-750.

553 Waldrop MP, Zak DR, Sinsabaugh RL (2004) Microbial community response to nitrogen deposition in
554 northern forest ecosystems. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **36**, 1443-1451.

555 Wang J, Zhu T, Ni H, Zhong H, Fu X, Wang J (2013) Effects of elevated CO₂ and nitrogen deposition on
556 ecosystem carbon fluxes on the sanjiang plain wetland in Northeast China. *Plos One*, **8**,
557 e66563. doi: org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066563.

558 Weedon J, Aerts R, Kowalchuk G, Vanbodegom P (2011) Enzymology under global change: organic
559 nitrogen turnover in alpine and sub-Arctic soils. *Biochemical Society Transactions*, **39**,

560 309-314.

561 Wieder WR, Bonan GB, Allison SD (2013) Global soil carbon projections are improved by modelling
562 microbial processes. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 909-912.

563 Xu X, Schimel JP, Thornton PE, Song X, Yuan F, Goswami S (2014) Substrate and environmental controls
564 on microbial assimilation of soil organic carbon: a framework for Earth system models.
565 *Ecology Letters*, **17**, 547-555.

566 Zeglin LH, Stursova M, Sinsabaugh RL, Collins SL (2007) Microbial responses to nitrogen addition in
567 three contrasting grassland ecosystems. *Oecologia*, **154**, 349-359.

568 Zhou L, Zhou X, Zhang B, Lu M, Luo Y, Liu L, Li B (2014) Different responses of soil respiration and its
569 components to nitrogen addition among biomes: a meta - analysis. *Global Change Biology*,
570 **20**, 2332-2343.

571 Zhou X, Wan S, Luo Y (2007) Source components and interannual variability of soil CO₂ efflux under
572 experimental warming and clipping in a grassland ecosystem. *Global Change Biology*, **13**,
573 761-775.

574
575

576 Figure captions:

577

578 Figure 1. The effects of N addition on soil glycosidase activity (a, GA) and the
579 relationships between the response ratio (RR) for soil respiration and the RR for
580 glycosidase activity following N addition (b). Error bars represent bootstrap 95%
581 confidence intervals (CIs). The effect of N addition was considered significant if the
582 CI of the effect size did not overlap with zero. The sample size for each variable is
583 shown next to the CI. Q_B and Q_w are defined in the Materials and methods section.
584 The RRs of the activities of the following enzymes were positively correlated with
585 RR-soil respiration: α -1,4-glucosidase (AG, $Y = 0.763X - 0.037$, $R^2 = 0.423$, $p <$
586 0.001), β -1,4-glucosidase (BG, $Y = 0.323X - 0.063$, $R^2 = 0.255$, $p < 0.001$),
587 β -D-cellobiosidase (CBH, $Y = 0.2X - 0.009$, $R^2 = 0.145$, $p = 0.003$) and
588 β -1,4-xylosidase (BX, $Y = 0.515X - 0.134$, $R^2 = 0.473$, $p < 0.001$).

589

590 Figure 2 The effects of nitrogen addition on soil glycosidase activity for various
591 methods of nitrogen addition. See Figure 1 for detailed information.

592

593 Figure 3 Relationships between the response ratios (RRs) for soil respiration and the
594 RRs for soil glycosidase activity for the methods of nitrogen addition. Relationships
595 between the RRs for glycosidase activity and RR-soil respiration for (a) N-addition
596 rate (medium: $Y = 0.442X - 0.014$, $R^2 = 0.760$, $p < 0.001$; high: $Y = 0.583X + 0.095$,
597 $R^2 = 0.286$, $p = 0.027$), (b) N-addition frequency (low: $Y = 0.418X + 0.053$, $R^2 =$
598 0.548 , $p < 0.001$; medium: $Y = 0.480X + 0.083$, $R^2 = 0.430$, $p = 0.001$), (c) N-addition
599 duration (short: $Y = 0.641X + 0.051$, $R^2 = 0.473$, $p < 0.001$; medium: $Y = 0.206X -$
600 0.068 , $R^2 = 0.552$, $p < 0.001$; long: $Y = 0.550X - 0.118$, $R^2 = 0.764$, $p < 0.001$) and (d)
601 N-addition form (NH_4NO_3 : $Y = 0.253X - 0.135$, $R^2 = 0.185$, $p < 0.001$; organic: $Y =$
602 $0.396X + 0.044$, $R^2 = 0.727$, $p < 0.001$; mixed: $Y = 0.733X + 0.095$, $R^2 = 0.436$, $p =$
603 0.002).

604

605 Figure 4 The effects of nitrogen addition on soil glycosidase activity for various types
606 of vegetation and soil. See Figure 1 for detailed information.

607

608 Figure 5 Relationships between the response ratios (RRs) for soil respiration and the
609 RRs for glycosidase activity for different types of (a) vegetation and (b) soil.
610 Relationships between the RRs of glycosidase activity and RR-soil respiration within
611 vegetation types (grassland: $Y = 0.885X - 0.103$, $R^2 = 0.626$, $p = 0.019$; farmland: $Y =$
612 $0.355X + 0.170$, $R^2 = 0.532$, $p < 0.001$) and soil types (Cambisols: $Y = 0.487X - 0.079$,
613 $R^2 = 0.640$, $p < 0.001$; Luvisols: $Y = 1.340X - 0.158$, $R^2 = 0.638$, $p = 0.031$; Podzols: Y
614 $= -0.295X + 0.013$, $R^2 = 0.420$, $p = 0.004$).

615

616 Supplementary tables and figures:

617

618 Table S1 Results for publication bias.

619

620 Table S2 Description of the 12 kinds of enzymes included in our preliminary analysis.

621

622 Table S3 Distribution of the methods of nitrogen addition for the various types of
623 vegetation and soil.

624

625 Figure S1 Global distribution of the nitrogen-addition experiments selected in this
626 meta-analysis. The map was created with ArcGIS.

627

628 Figure S2 Frequency distributions of the response ratios (RR) of (a) α -1,4-glucosidase
629 (AG), (b) β -1,4-glucosidase (BG), (c) β -D-cellobiosidase (CBH) and (d)
630 β -1,4-xylosidase (BX).

631

632 Figure S3 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of soil respiration (SR) and
633 the RRs of (a) α -1,4-glucosidase (AG), (b) β -1,4-glucosidase (BG), (c)
634 β -D-cellobiosidase (CBH), (d) β -1,4-xylosidase (BX), (e) phenol oxidase (PO), (f)
635 polyphenol oxidase (PHO), (g) invertase, (h) urease, (i) peroxidase (PER), (j)
636 β -1,4-N-acetylglucosaminidase (NAG), (k) acid (alkaline) phosphatase (AP) and (l)
637 leucine amino peptidase (LAP).

638

639 Figure S4 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of soil glycosidase activity
640 and (a) N-addition rate, (b) N-addition duration, (c) N-addition frequency and (d)
641 sample size.

642

643 Figure S5 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of glycosidase activity and
644 the RR of soil respiration (SR) for the different methods of SR measurement.

645

646 Figure S6 The effects of N addition on soil respiration from previous meta-analyses.

647 Error bars represent bootstrap 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The effect of N

648 addition was considered significant if the CI of the effect size did not overlap zero.

649 The sample size for each variable is shown next to the CI. This figure was redrawn

650 from previous meta-analyses published by (a, b and c) Zhou *et al.* 2014, (d) Liu *et al.*
651 2010, (e) Lu *et al.* 2011 and (f) Janssens *et al.* 2010. Ra, autotrophic respiration; Rh,
652 heterotrophic respiration; SR, soil respiration.

653
654 Figure S7 (a) The effects of N addition on the activities of soil oxidative C-acquiring
655 enzymes. Frequency distributions of the response ratios (RR) of (b) oxidative
656 enzymes, (c) phenol oxidase (PO), (d) peroxidase (PER) and (e) polyphenol oxidase
657 (PHO). Error bars represent bootstrap 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The effect of N
658 addition was considered significant if the CI of the effect size did not overlap zero.
659 The sample size for each variable is shown next to the CI. Q_B and Q_w are defined in
660 the Materials and methods section.

661
662 Figure S8 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of glycosidase activity and
663 the RR of aboveground biomass (AGB).

664
665 Figure S9 Relationships between the possible changes in microbial communities and
666 physiology and the response ratios (RR) of glycosidase activity of (a) microbial
667 abundance, (b) bacterial abundance, (c) fungal abundance, (d) fungi/bacteria, (e)
668 microbial biomass carbon (MBC), (f) microbial biomass nitrogen (MBN) and (g)
669 MBC/MBN. The relationships between the changes in microbial communities and
670 physiology induced by N addition and their links with the corresponding changes in
671 soil respiration were synthesized by Treseder *et al.* (2008).

672
673 Figure S10 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of glycosidase activity and
674 the (a) RR of soil total nitrogen (STN), (b) RR of dissolved organic nitrogen (DON),
675 (c) RR of the substrate C:N ratio and (d) substrate C:N ratio.

676
677 Figure S11 Relationships between the response ratio (RR) of glycosidase activity and
678 (a) the substrate pH and (b) the RR of the substrate pH.









