

Soil Biology and Biochemistry

Ecological groups and isotopic niches of earthworms

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Article Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Earthworms; Stable isotopes; Functional groups; Epigeic; Anecic; Endogeic
Corresponding Author:	Chih-Han Chang, Ph.D. National Taiwan University Taipei, TAIWAN
First Author:	Gen-Chang Hsu, B.S.
Order of Authors:	Gen-Chang Hsu, B.S.
	Katalin Szlavecz, Ph.D.
	Csaba Csuzdi, Ph.D.
	Michael Bernard, M.S.
	Chih-Han Chang, Ph.D.
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED STATES
Suggested Reviewers:	Anton Potapov, PhD University of Göttingen potapov.msu@gmail.com Dr. Potapov is an expert in soil food web, soil fauna feeding ecology, and stable isotopes.
	Maria J.I. Briones, PhD Professor, University of Vigo Faculty of Biology mbriones@uvigo.es Dr. Briones is an expert in earthworm ecology and stable isotope ecology.
	Bruce Snyder, Ph.D. Associate Professor bruce.snyder@gcsu.edu Dr. Snyder is an expert in earthworm ecology, ecological categorization, and diversity. He is also an expert in using stable isotopes in soil ecological studies, including earthworms.
	Erin Cameron, Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Saint Mary's University erin.cameron@smu.ca Dr. Cameron is an expert in earthworm ecology and biodiversity at both local and global scales.



Dr. Karl Ritz, Editor-in-Chief
Soil Biology & Biochemistry

June 3rd, 2022

Dear Dr. Ritz,

We are pleased to submit the following manuscript for consideration for publication as a regular paper in *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*:

Title: Ecological groups and isotopic niches of earthworms

Authors: Gen-Chang Hsu, Katalin Szlavecz, Csaba Csuzdi, Michael Bernard, Chih-Han Chang

Categorization of earthworms into ecological groups has been happening for more than 100 years, and a system based on three main ecological categories has been widely used in earthworm ecological studies for several decades. However, a sizable gap exists in how the ecological groups are categorized, and how they are used in linking earthworm community structures to ecological processes and properties. In this manuscript, we attempted to revisit the widely used earthworm ecological categorization by analyzing the stable isotopes of carbon and nitrogen from 251 earthworm individuals representing 10 species commonly found in arable fields and deciduous forests in temperate North America. We recognized nine isotopic niches within the three ecological groups, and highlighted that rather than forming distinct categories, isotopic niches form a continuum composed of both trophic specialists and generalists, with no clear boundary between ecological groups. We further proposed to incorporate stable isotope data as functional traits when studying earthworm ecological groups, as it informs us about the function of the species as well as about their interactions within a habitat. We believe this manuscript is appropriate for publication in *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* because it addressed one of the fundamental yet unanswered questions in earthworm ecology, and has the potential to be applied in studies focusing on ecosystem functions.

This manuscript has not been published elsewhere and is not under consideration by another journal. All authors have approved the manuscript and agreed to submit it to *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chih-Han Chang
Assistant Professor
Department of Life Science / Institute of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
National Taiwan University
Taipei, Taiwan
chihhanchang@ntu.edu.tw; chihhanchang.ntu@gmail.com

Highlights

- Earthworm ecological groups are revisited using C and N stable isotopes.
- Nine isotopic niches are recognized.
- Isotopic niches form a continuum, with no clear boundary between ecological groups.
- Species within the same ecological group exhibit isotopic niche differentiation.
- We propose to include stable isotopic niches in the functional trait database.

Ecological groups and isotopic niches of earthworms

Gen-Chang Hsu^{a,1}, Katalin Szlavecz^{b,1}, Csaba Csuzdi^c, Michael Bernard^b, Chih-Han

Chang^{a,d,*}

a. Department of Life Science, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

b. Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD,

USA

c. Eszterházy Károly Catholic University, Eger, Hungary

d. Institute of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, National Taiwan University, Taipei,

Taiwan

1. G.C.H. and K.S. contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding author: chihhanchang@ntu.edu.tw; chihhanchang.ntu@gmail.com

Abstract

Earthworms are generally categorized into three ecological groups. This categorization and its two refined versions have been widely used in studies focusing on earthworm community structure, biological invasions, and earthworm effects on vegetation, soil properties, carbon and nitrogen cycling, and other ecosystem functions. We revisited this categorization system by analyzing the stable isotopes of carbon and nitrogen (^{13}C and ^{15}N) from 10 earthworm species commonly found in arable fields and deciduous forests in temperate North America. We showed that up to nine isotopic niches utilized by earthworms can be distinguished in the two-dimensional space delimited by $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. Rather than forming distinct categories, isotopic niches of different ecological groups form a continuum, ranging from species feeding on leaf litter to those feeding on highly processed soil organic matter. Along this continuum, species of the same ecological group can exhibit considerable isotopic niche differentiation and resource partitioning. These results, together with field observations on native Lumbricidae in Europe, suggest that, despite their convenience, there are limitations to the commonly used ecological categories. We propose to incorporate stable isotopes as functional traits in studying earthworm ecology and the linkage between earthworm communities and ecosystem functions. Moreover, to fill existing knowledge gaps, the isotopic approach needs to be further expanded to native earthworm communities around the world, particularly outside Western Europe and North America, and to earthworm families and major taxonomic groups other than Lumbricidae, such as Glossoscolecidae, Acanthodrilidae, and Megascolecidae.

Keywords: Earthworms, Stable isotopes, Functional groups, Epigeic, Anecic, Endogeic

1. Introduction

Guilds, ecological groups, and functional groups are commonly used concepts in food web modeling and in studies attempting to link community structures to ecosystem functions (Wilson, 1999; Blondel, 2003; Voigt et al., 2007). They provide a proxy without detailed knowledge on the taxonomic identity and ecology of individual species. In studies focusing on the soil ecosystem, this is frequently the only feasible approach as the large number of species of soil fauna, most of which are unknown to science, makes incorporating species identities into models practically infeasible. Applied soil ecology projects, such as assessment of effects of land management, disturbances and recovery, or efficiency of ecosystem restoration, may include soil fauna surveys (e.g. Frouz et al., 2013; Gongalsky and Persson, 2013). Due to lack of time, taxonomic expertise, or other resources, or because an exact species list is not the focal component of the study, researchers may report on larger taxonomic or ecological groups. This is true not only for microscopic animals, such as nematodes and collembolans, but also for organisms that are relatively large and perceived as well-studied, such as earthworms.

Earthworms are the dominant group of soil fauna in many temperate and tropical ecosystems. Their feeding and burrowing lead to translocation and transformation of detritus and soil organic matter, affect soil microbial communities, and change resources available to other soil animals (Frelich et al., 2019; Ferlian et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2021). They are often considered “ecosystem engineers” as their presence fundamentally changes the soil habitat, and has profound impacts on the understory vegetation, leaf litter layer, soil properties, nutrient dynamics, and soil C and N cycles (Craven et al., 2017; Frelich et al., 2019; Ferlian et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2021).

65

66 Earthworms are generally categorized into three main ecological groups—epigeic,
67 endogeic, and anecic—based on their morphology, location in the soil profile, and feeding
68 habits (Bouché, 1977). Epigeic species are litter feeders living in the litter-soil interface;
69 endogeic species are soil feeders living in the soil; anecic species are large-bodied litter
70 feeders that live in permanent vertical burrows deep in the soil (Brown, 1995; Curry and
71 Schmidt, 2007). Although researchers quite often credited and therefore cited Bouché (1972,
72 1977) for the three terms, the concepts of these ecological categories had taken shape almost
73 a century before Bouché (Örley, 1885), and their definitions have since been modified by
74 various authors and have evolved considerably (Lavelle, 1981; Lee, 1985).

75

76 While rarely acknowledged by modern researchers, ecological categorization of
77 earthworms similar to the system used nowadays was first proposed by Örley (1885), who
78 distinguished three groups: Large-bodied species penetrating to 90–120 cm deep in the soil of
79 forests and meadows; smaller species living in wood and other vegetable matter; species
80 inhabiting the clayey soil and mud of riparian banks and standing waters. Although Örley (1885)
81 did not name them, the three groups are consistent with the modern concept of anecic, epigeic,
82 and endogeic species, respectively. Similar categories for the New Zealandian Megascolecidae
83 were presented by Lee (1959), who distinguished litter species (small and heavily pigmented),
84 topsoil species (large, pigmented, and living in permanent burrows), and subsoil species (large,
85 unpigmented, and living in the deeper soil layers), and by Perel (1975), who recognized two
86 main life forms (ecological groups), one feeding on the soil surface and the other feeding in
87 the soil. Perel (1975) further divided these two main groups into subgroups based upon their
88 vertical distribution in the soil. The first group, i.e. those feeding on the soil surface, were
89 categorized into (1) surface living species, (2) transitory species active between the surface and

the upper soil layer, and (3) deep burrowing species. The second group, i.e. species feeding in the soil, were categorized into three subgroups as well: living in the (1) upper, (2) middle, and (3) deeper soil layers.

With 50 years of research on earthworm taxonomy, evolution, life history, physiology, and ecology after Bouché's 1972 book, we now have a better understanding on the spectrum of the ecological diversity of these organisms (Neilson et al., 2000; Curry and Schmidt, 2007; Zicsi et al., 2011), partially aided by studies focusing on invasive earthworms and their ecological impacts (Szlavecz et al., 2011, 2018; Chang et al., 2017, 2021; Craven et al., 2017; Taheri et al., 2018; Frelich et al., 2019; Ferlian et al., 2020). Currently, two different systems of earthworm ecological categorizations are most frequently used by taxonomists and ecologists: (1) Bouché's system (Bouché, 1972, 1977) and (2) Perel and Lavelle's system (Perel, 1975; Lavelle, 1981). Bouché's (1972, 1977) system is composed of three main categories—epigeic, endogeic, and anecic—and four intermediate categories—epi-anecic, endo-anecic, epi-endogeic, and intermediate. Lavelle (1981) took Bouché's (1972, 1977) three main categories and further divided the endogeic group into three categories: polyhumic endogeic, mesohumic endogeic, and oligohumic endogeic (Fig. 1). Through years of use, the term epi-endogeic was also included by subsequent researchers into their vocabulary to describe species that not only live in the leaf litter but also spend a considerable amount of time in the surface soil (Fig. 1). Coincidentally, these six categories completely overlap with the aforementioned six subgroups proposed by Perel (1975). Both Bouché's system and Perel and Lavelle's system are widely adopted by earthworm researchers (Brown, 1995; Bottinelli et al., 2020; Bottinelli and Capowiez, 2021), likely for being relatively comprehensible and easy to use.

Regardless of which system was adopted, a simplified version containing only the three main categories, epigeic, endogeic, and anecic (e.g. Edwards and Bohlen, 1996; Bohlen et al., 2004; Briones and Alvarez-Otero et, 2018; Potapov et al., 2022), has been widely used to investigate how earthworms, particularly invasive species, affect the structure and function of ecosystems (Brown, 1995; Bottinelli et al., 2020; Bottinelli and Capowiez, 2021). Such studies have been summarized in meta-analyses focusing on plant growth (van Groenigen et al., 2014; Xiao et al., 2018), soil nutrient and toxic elements (van Groenigen et al., 2019; Ferlian et al., 2020; Sizmur and Richardson, 2020), soil faunal and microbial biodiversity (Ferlian et al., 2018), plant communities (Craven et al., 2017), and greenhouse gas emission (Lubbers et al., 2013). In most of these studies, the categories epigeic, endogeic, and anecic are considered as “ecological groups”, while in others, they are considered as “guilds” (van Groenigen et al., 2019) or “functional groups” (Ferlian et al., 2018). In studies focusing on ecosystem functions, different species in the same group have sometimes been reported having inconsistent effects on the targeted ecosystem properties (e.g. Chang et al., 2016a, b), calling into question whether these ecological categories are meaningful proxies for functional entities.

Community ecologists have long acknowledged that guilds, ecological groups, and functional groups encompass different concepts, yet in practice, these terms have been frequently used interchangeably (see Blondel, 2003 for a detailed discussion). In earthworms, even when “ecological groups” was used, as in most aforementioned studies, it was treated implicitly as synonymous to functional groups, as the categorization was used to infer ecological impacts on other organisms or ecosystem functions, rather than niche partitioning between groups or interspecific interactions within groups. However, given that ecological groups are, by definition, not synonymous to functional groups, the inconsistent results

researchers have observed so far should not be surprising. In earthworm surveys, species are often classified into one or another category based upon their color or where they were found in the soil profile, without detailed knowledge about their resource uses and mixing activities. Zicsi et al. (2011) highlighted this mismatch in a series of experiments using 30 Lumbricidae species from Europe, of which 21 were endemic. If species in the same ecological category already differ in litter feeding and soil mixing, the two fundamental characteristics that define the three main ecological categories, how could we expect these species to have similar influence on ecosystem functions?

In the last decade, several researchers appealed for not treating ecological categories and functional groups as synonyms (Bottinelli and Capowiez, 2021), for strictly adhering to Bouché's (1972, 1977) original definition of the three main groups and four intermediate groups (Bottinelli et al., 2020), for using species identity instead when investigating ecosystem functions (Chang et al., 2016b), and for redefining or refining these groups (Neilson et al., 2000; Zicsi et al., 2011). Recently, the trait-based approach was used to numerically redefine Bouché's seven categories based on 13 anatomical and histological morphologies, offering the first quantitative approach to categorizing earthworm ecological groups (Bottinelli et al., 2020). The study concluded that earthworm's ecological strategies are continuous rather than categorical, and epigeic, endogeic, and anecic are just the three endpoints of this continuous distribution. In addition to morphology, the authors also called for new traits that can be linked to the ecology and behavior of investigated species.

Stable isotopes have been widely used to study the feeding ecology of soil invertebrates, particularly nematodes (Kudrin et al., 2015; Melody et al., 2016), mites (Maraun et al., 2011), proturans (Bluhm et al., 2019), collembolans (Ferlian et al., 2015; Potapov et al., 2021), and

earthworms (Neilson et al., 2000; Melody and Schmidt, 2012; Ferlian et al., 2014; Potapov et al., 2019c). This technique is also instrumental in our current understanding on trophic niche partitioning of soil fauna, and on how different groups of soil fauna are involved in belowground processes (Pollierer et al., 2009; Hyodo et al., 2010; Klärner et al., 2014; Potapov et al., 2019a,b). Isotopic studies focusing on earthworms largely confirmed the three main ecological groups (Schmidt et al., 1997, 2004; Scheu and Falca, 2000; Briones et al., 2001; Pollierer et al., 2009; Potapov et al., 2019c), provided evidence for niche differentiation and competition (Melody and Schmidt, 2012; Chang et al., 2016b), and further highlighted the importance of soil microbes in the diet of earthworms (Ferlian et al., 2014; Larsen et al., 2016). However, while stable isotopes, sometimes coupled with other techniques, have been instrumental in redefining feeding groups in collembolans and mites (Maraun et al., 2011; Potapov et al., 2016, 2021), and despite a plethora of studies on the stable isotope ecology of earthworms, this approach has not been applied to meaningfully refine earthworm ecological groups.

The objective of this study is to examine the idea of using the natural abundance of carbon and nitrogen stable isotopes (^{13}C and ^{15}N) to refine the widely used ecological groups of earthworms under the framework outlined by Perel and Lavelle (Perel, 1975; Lavelle, 1981). We predicted that based on the isotopic niches of earthworm species (1) the three main ecological categories would form a continuum in the isotopic space, (2) species within the same ecological category can be divided into subgroups consistent with Perel and Lavelle's groupings based on their isotopic niche positions, and (3) species within the same subgroup can be further categorized as a trophic specialist or a trophic generalist based on their isotopic niche breadths.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Field sites and plots

Data for this study were collected from five sites, representing three habitat types: arable field, abandoned arable field, and mature deciduous forest. Data from arable and abandoned arable fields were newly collected, whereas data from the forests have been reported in Chang et al. (2016b). Information about the sites is detailed below.

2.1.1 Arable field 1 (ARABLE1)

Arable field 1 is part of the USDA ARS Beltsville Farming System Project (FSP) in Maryland, USA. The project was established in 1996 to evaluate the long-term sustainability of conventional and organic grain crop production. The five cropping systems differ in crop rotation, mode of tillage, fertilizer use and pest control. A total of 68 plots cover 16 ha on the Atlantic Coastal Plain. The dominant soil types are silt loams with an argillic horizon around 20-60 cm depth. Mean annual temperature is 12.8°C and the 30-yr average annual precipitation at the site is 1110 mm, distributed evenly through the year. The field is not irrigated (Cavigelli et al., 2008). Sampling at Arable field 1 was conducted in a no-till plot (plot 306) with a 3-year rotation of corn - soybean - wheat & soybean. Sampling was conducted on November 8th, 2011, a “corn” year, after corn harvest.

2.1.2 Abandoned arable fields 1 and 2 (ABANDONED1 and ABANDONED2)

Abandoned arable fields 1 and 2 are located in properties managed by the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC), Maryland, USA. The SERC abandoned field site is in a self-contained watershed, 13 hectares of which had been in continuous corn agriculture for 34 years since 1978. Agriculture ceased in 2012, and the site was converted to an experimental research forest manipulating tree diversity and functional traits. A total of 75 plots were delineated and planting of tree seedlings started in 2013. We chose nine plots in one location as potential sites for long term monitoring (ABANDONED1). Another two plots were also sampled (ABANDONED2). These two plots, in addition to being spatially separated from ABANDONED1, showed apparent differences in vegetation and land use history. Specifically, C₄ (corn) and C₃ (soybean) crops were planted here. At the time of the earthworm sampling (May-June 2013), the fields were covered with corn detritus, and early successional herbaceous weeds, and the first growing season of the planted small tree seedlings just started. We consider this habitat an abandoned corn field and the isotopic signatures of the earthworms reflecting those conditions.

2.1.3 Mature forests 1 and 2 (*FOREST1* and *FOREST2*)

Mature forests 1 and 2 are located in the Treefall forest stand at SERC, which is a 150-year-old secondary forest dominated by tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), and oaks (e.g. *Quercus falcata* and *Q. alba*). The stand was sampled in September 2011 and then again in August 2013. In both years, samples were taken from a 25 × 25 m plot. Because of non-overlapping sampling locations, different terrains, and considerably different earthworm species compositions (Chang et al. 2016b), data from the two sampling events were treated separately (i.e., Mature forest 1 and Mature forest 2). See Chang et al. (2016b) for detailed site description and sampling procedures.

2.2 Sampling

At ARABLE1, earthworms were collected from four randomly selected 1×1 m quadrats 1–5 m away from the south (short) edge of the no-till plot using electroshocking. A 0–15 cm deep core was collected from each quadrat using a soil corer (5 cm diameter), and divided into three 5-cm increments (0–5 cm, 5–10 cm, and 10–15 cm).

At ABANDONED1 and ABANDONED2, five 0.5×0.5 m quadrats were designated at the center and the four corners (5 m away from the plot edge) of the newly established plots. Earthworms were collected by slowly applying mustard suspension on the soil surface within the quadrat. Three 0–20 cm deep soil cores were collected around the center quadrat and a randomly selected corner quadrat using a soil corer (3 cm diameter) and divided into the 0–2, 2–5, 5–10, and 10–20 cm deep increments. Samples of the same increment from the same quadrat were mixed to form a composite sample.

At FOREST1 and FOREST2, earthworms were collected from three randomly selected 1×1 m quadrats at least 15 m away from each other using electroshocking. Three 0–15 cm deep cores were collected from each quadrat using a soil corer (5 cm diameter), and divided into three 5-cm increments (0–5 cm, 5–10 cm, and 10–15 cm). Samples of the same increment from the same quadrat were analyzed separately.

The collected earthworms were identified to species alive and then stored at -20°C until further processing. A total of 251 earthworm individuals representing 10 species were collected, including 102 specimens from FOREST1 and FOREST2 (Chang et al. 2016b) and

149 newly collected specimens from ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2. The 10 species can be categorized into the three commonly used ecological groups: (1) epigeic—*Lumbricus rubellus* Hoffmeister, 1843 and *Metaphire hilgendorfi* (Michaelsen, 1892), (2) endogeic—*Aporrectodea caliginosa* (Savigny, 1826), *Aporrectodea trapezoides* (Dugés, 1828), *Allolobophora chlorotica* (Savigny, 1826), *Diplocardia caroliniana* Eisen, 1899, *Eisenoides lonnbergi* (Michaelsen, 1894), and *Octolasion cyaneum* (Savigny, 1826), and (3) anecic—*Lumbricus friendi* Cognetti, 1904 and *Lumbricus terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758.

2.3 Sample processing and isotopic analysis

Earthworm specimens were cleaned with distilled water, dissected to remove gut and gut content, freeze-dried, and homogenized. Soil samples were sieved and homogenized through a 2-mm sieve, oven-dried, and pulverized. The C and N elemental and stable isotope composition of earthworm and soil samples were analyzed at the UC Davis Stable Isotope Facility, Davis, CA, USA using either a PDZ Europa 20-20 isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Sercon Ltd., Cheshire, UK) coupled with an Elementar Vario EL Cube or Micro Cube elemental analyzer (Elementar Analysensysteme GmbH, Hanau, Germany) or a PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL elemental analyzer (Sercon Ltd., Cheshire, UK). Stable isotope ratios of C and N ($^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ and $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$) were expressed using the delta (δ) notation following the equation $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{sample}}$ or $\delta^{15}\text{N}_{\text{sample}} = [R_{\text{sample}} / R_{\text{standard}} - 1] \times 1000\text{‰}$, where R_{sample} is the ratio ($^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ or $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$) in the samples, and R_{standard} is the isotope ratios in the standards (Pee Dee Belemnite for C and atmospheric nitrogen for N).

2.4 Data analyses

The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of earthworm samples were standardized within each site by subtracting the differences between plot-level (the plot from which the earthworm individual was collected) and site-level $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of soil samples at 0-5 cm depth. For the sites ABANDONED1 and ABANDONED2, the isotope values of soil samples at 0-5 cm depth were derived as the weighted average of the isotope values at 0-2 cm and 2-5 cm depth. We used surface soil for standardization as opposed to leaf litter because at the time of earthworm and soil sampling at ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2, the litter on the soil surface was not abundant enough to be a reasonable representative of basal resources of the study sites. In contrast, the surface soil hosted isotopic signals that were integrated through different seasons, and provided a better proxy of background isotopic signatures for our standardization purpose.

To examine the isotopic niche breadth of earthworm species, we calculated Bayesian standard ellipse area (SEA_B), which represents the core isotopic niche of a population, using the R package SIBER (Jackson et al., 2011). Three Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains were run, each with 30,000 iterations and a burn-in number of 3,000. An inverse Wishart prior was used to initiate the model. Chain convergence was assessed via trace plots and Geweke diagnostics. The 95% high density interval (HDI) was computed to quantify the uncertainty in SEA_B estimates. The percentage of overlapping SEA_B was also calculated to measure the degree of core niche overlap between species pairs.

To test for the differences in species' total isotopic niches (including niche position and niche breadth), we further performed pairwise permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) and permutational test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions (PERMDISP) on the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of earthworm species using the R package vegan

(Oksanen et al., 2013). PERMANOVA tests the null hypothesis of no difference in the centroid (i.e., niche position) and/or dispersion (i.e., niche breadth) of the species pairs in the isotopic space, whereas PERMDISP specifically tests the null hypothesis of no difference in the dispersion (i.e., niche breadth) of the species pairs in the isotopic space. All analyses were performed in R version 4.1.0 (R Core Team, 2021).

In addition to data from ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2, data collected at FOREST1 and FOREST2 previously reported in Chang et al. (2016b) were also analyzed. As isotopic niche sizes and overlaps in the two forest plots have already been reported in Chang et al. (2016b), the same analyses were not repeated here. However, in Chang et al. (2016b), the position and breadth of the total isotopic niches were compared using a different approach. Thus, to ensure that data from the five plots can be compared and synthesized, we re-plotted the data from FOREST1 and FOREST2 following the same standardization procedure as we did for the other three sites, and re-analyzed niche position and niche breadth using PERMANOVA and PERMDISP.

3. Results

3.1 Stable isotope signatures of soil

$\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of soil samples were lower at the forest sites (FOREST1 and FOREST2) than at the arable/abandoned field sites (ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2) (Fig. 2), and had the highest C_4 signatures at ABANDONED1. The two forest sites were similar to each other and showed a depth profile of increasing $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values in deeper soils. The two abandoned field sites were distinct, with ABANDONED1 showing higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values than

ABANDONED2. Additionally, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values at ABANDONED2 increased with soil depth, similar to those in the forests, whereas $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values at ABANDONED1 were lowest in the deepest soil (10-20 cm) followed by the surface soil (0-2 cm) (Fig. 2).

$\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values of soil samples were lower at the forest sites (FOREST1 and FOREST2) than at the arable/abandoned field sites (ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2) (Fig. 2), showing potential influence of synthetic fertilizers in the arable/abandoned field sites. The two forest sites (FOREST1 and FOREST2) were similar to each other and showed a depth profile of increasing $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in deeper soils. $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values decreased slightly with soil depth at the two abandoned field sites (Fig. 2).

3.2 Isotopic niches of earthworm species

3.2.1 Arable field 1

At ARABLE1, two endogeic earthworm species were collected: *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides* (Fig. 3). *Ap. caliginosa* had higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the upper part of the isotopic space, whereas *Ap. trapezoides* had lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the lower part of the isotopic space (Fig. 3).

Comparison of the total isotopic niches suggested niche differentiation between the two species (PERMANOVA $P = 0.004$; PERMDISP $P = 0.38$) (Appendix S1: Table S1). The core niche areas of *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides* were similar in size ($\text{SEA}_B = 3.04\text{‰}^2$ and 4.18‰^2 , respectively) (Fig. 3, Appendix S1: Table S2, Fig. S1) and showed low degrees of mutual overlap (*ca.* 10.0%) (Figs. 3 and 4, Appendix S1: Table S3).

3.2.2 Abandoned arable field 1

At ABANDONED1, six earthworm species were collected, including *Ap. caliginosa*, *Ap. trapezoides*, *Al. chlorotica*, *Di. caroliniana*, *L. friendi*, and *L. rubellus* (Fig. 3). Overall, the three endogeic species, *Ap. caliginosa*, *Ap. trapezoides*, and *Al. chlorotica*, had higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the upper-right part of the isotopic space; the anecic species, *L. friendi*, had lower isotope values and occupied an isotopic niche slightly below those of the endogeic species; the epigeic species, *L. rubellus*, had the lowest values and occupied the lower-left part of the isotopic space; the native species, *Di. caroliniana*, showed a distinct isotopic niche position from the other species (Fig. 3).

Pairwise comparisons of the total isotopic niches further suggested niche differentiation between species of different ecological groups: *Ap. caliginosa* and *L. friendi* (PERMANOVA $P = 0.01$; PERMDISP $P = 0.81$), *Ap. caliginosa* and *L. rubellus* (PERMANOVA $P = 0.002$; PERMDISP $P = 0.16$), *Ap. trapezoides* and *L. rubellus* (PERMANOVA $P = 0.03$; PERMDISP $P = 0.17$), and *L. friendi* and *L. rubellus* (PERMANOVA $P = 0.06$; PERMDISP $P = 0.12$) (Appendix S1: Table S1).

Among the three endogeic species, *Al. chlorotica* had a larger core niche area ($\text{SEA}_b = 14.82\% ^2$) compared with *Ap. caliginosa* ($\text{SEA}_b = 5.29\% ^2$) and *Ap. trapezoides* ($\text{SEA}_b = 6.53\% ^2$) (Fig. 3, Appendix S1: Table S2, Fig. S1). The percentages of overlapping SEA_B between species pairs were low to moderate on average ($< 50.0\%$), except for three endogeic and anecic species: 71.4% of the SEA_B of *L. friendi* overlapped with that of *Al. chlorotica*; 79.1% and 59.7% of the SEA_B of *Ap. trapezoides* overlapped with that of *Al. chlorotica* and *L. friendi*, respectively (Figs. 3 and 4, Appendix S1: Table S3).

3.2.3 Abandoned arable field 2

At ABANDONED2, the same six earthworm species as at ABANDONED1 were collected (Fig. 3). Similar to ABANDONED1, the three endogeic species, *Ap. caliginosa*, *Ap. trapezoides*, and *Al. chlorotica*, had higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the upper part of the isotopic space, whereas the anecic species, *L. friendi*, and the epigeic species, *L. rubellus*, had lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the lower part of the isotopic space (Fig. 3). The native species, *Di. caroliniana*, also showed a distinct isotopic niche position from the other species, indicating its unique feeding habits (Fig. 3). However, pairwise comparisons of the total isotopic niches did not show any significant niche differences between species (Appendix S1: Table S1). The core niche area was smallest in *Ap. trapezoides* ($\text{SEA}_b = 3.25\text{‰}^2$) and largest in *Ap. caliginosa* ($\text{SEA}_b = 11.10\text{‰}^2$) (Fig. 3, Appendix S1: Table S2, Fig. S1). The percentages of overlapping SEA_B between species pairs were low to moderate on average ($< 50.0\%$), except for two endogeic species: 67.5% of the SEA_B of *Ap. trapezoides* overlapped with that of *Ap. caliginosa* (Figs. 3 and 4, Appendix S1: Table S3).

3.2.4 Mature forest 1 and Mature forest 2

At FOREST1, five earthworm species were collected, including *Ap. caliginosa*, *E. lonnbergi*, *L. rubellus*, *L. terrestris*, and *O. cyaneum* (Fig. 5). As previously reported (Chang et al. 2016b), *O. cyaneum* and *E. lonnbergi* had higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the upper part of the isotopic space, whereas the anecic species *L. terrestris* and the epigeic species *L. rubellus* had lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values and occupied the lower part of the isotopic space (Fig. 5), with *Ap. caliginosa* sitting in between. A similar pattern can be seen at FOREST2 (Fig. 5).

Consistent with the results in Chang et al. (2016b), niche differentiation was confirmed in all species pairs at FOREST1 and FOREST2 except between *E. lonnbergi* and *O. cyaneum* at FOREST1 (PERMANOVA $P = 0.99$; PERMDISP $P = 0.99$) (Fig. 5, Appendix S1: Table S1, Fig. S2).

3.2.5 Isotope discrimination between soil and earthworms across sites

The carbon and nitrogen isotope discrimination ($\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\Delta^{15}\text{N}$) between the soil and earthworm species across the five study sites revealed nine potential isotopic niches of earthworms that form a continuum along the three main ecological groups, while the native species *Di. caroliniana* occupied a distinct niche position from the remaining species in the isotopic space (Fig. 6).

3.3 Variations in niche patterns of *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides*

Ap. caliginosa and *Ap. trapezoides* are phylogenetically related species belonging to the *Ap. caliginosa* species complex. They were previously considered different ecomorphs of the same species, and their taxonomic status was confirmed only recently (Perez-Losada et al., 2009; Fernandez et al., 2012). The coexistence of the two species at ARABLE1, ABANDONED1, and ABANDONED2 provided us with a rare opportunity to investigate their potential niche differentiation.

At ARABLE1 and ABANDONED1, the sizes of the core isotopic niche areas (SEA_B) of *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides* were comparatively similar, although the core niche of *Ap. trapezoides* tended to be slightly larger than that of *Ap. caliginosa* (*Ap. caliginosa* vs. *Ap.*

439 *trapezoides*; ARABLE1: $SEA_B = 3.04\text{‰}^2$ vs. 4.18‰^2 ; ABANDONED1: $SEA_B = 5.29\text{‰}^2$ vs.
440 6.53‰^2) (Appendix S1: Table S2, Fig. S1). The core niches of *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap.*
441 *trapezoides* were relatively separated, with the SEA_B of *Ap. caliginosa* lying above that of
442 *Ap. trapezoides* (i.e., higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values for *Ap. caliginosa* than for *Ap. trapezoides*) (Fig. 3).
443 The percentages of mutual SEA_B overlaps between the two species were only low to
444 moderate (*Ap. caliginosa* vs. *Ap. trapezoides*; ARABLE1: 11.7% vs. 8.8%; ABANDONED1:
445 28.9% vs. 23.0%) (Figs. 3 and 4, Appendix S1: Table S3).

446

447 In contrast to the patterns at ARABLE1 and ABANDONED1, the core niche area of *Ap.*
448 *caliginosa* was more than three times larger than that of *Ap. trapezoides* at ABANDONED2
449 (*Ap. caliginosa* vs. *Ap. trapezoides*; $SEA_B = 11.10\text{‰}^2$ vs. 3.25‰^2) (Appendix S1: Table S2,
450 Fig. S1). The core niches of the two species overlapped substantially (Fig. 3), yet the
451 percentages of mutual SEA_B overlaps were highly asymmetric (*Ap. caliginosa* vs. *Ap.*
452 *trapezoides*; $SEA_B = 21.2\%$ vs. 67.5%) because of the large differences in their niche areas
453 (Figs. 3 and 4, Appendix S1: Table S3).

454

455 The total isotopic niches of the two species differed significantly at ARABLE1
456 (PERMANOVA $P = 0.004$, PERMDISP $P = 0.38$) but not at ABANDONED1
457 (PERMANOVA $P = 0.14$, PERMDISP $P = 0.91$) or ABANDONED2 (PERMANOVA $P =$
458 0.56 , PERMDISP $P = 0.09$) (Appendix S1: Table S1).

459

460 **4. Discussion**

461

462 Our results confirmed the documented observations of isotopic niche differences
463 between commonly recognized ecological groups of earthworms, while also further revealed

deeper insights among endogeic species. Consistent with previous studies (Schmidt et al., 1997; Scheu and Falca, 2000; Pollierer et al., 2009; Melody and Schmidt, 2012; Potapov et al., 2019b,c), endogeic species had higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values compared to epigeic species. Moreover, across the three studied land use types and all five sites, isotopic differences were also evident among endogeic species, suggesting potential niche differentiation and the need for a more refined ecological grouping system within the endogeic category.

Among the five sites, ABANDONED2 had considerably higher isotopic overlaps between species, and is the only site not showing any statistically significant interspecific isotopic niche difference. We suspected that this was due to a combination of strong C_3 signals from herbaceous plants growing at ABANDONED2, C_4 legacy in the soil from past land use (corn field), and great spatial heterogeneity created by patches of growing C_3 (mostly forbs) and C_4 (mostly graminoids) plants. Thus, our discussions below will mostly focus on the other four sites.

4.1 Isotopic niche differentiation between endogeic species

Both arable fields (including abandoned ones) and forests can have up to three prominent endogeic species: *Al. chlorotica*, *Ap. trapezoides*, and *Ap. caliginosa* in arable fields and *Ap. caliginosa*, *O. cyaneum*, and *E. lonnbergi* in forests. In arable fields, isotopic niche differences can be seen between *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides*, with the former being more enriched in both ^{13}C and ^{15}N and only small to moderate mutual SEA_B overlaps (8.8-28.9%) between the two species. Similarly, in forests, the three endogeic species, *Ap. caliginosa*, *E. lonnbergi*, and *O. cyaneum*, occupied distinct isotopic niches. However, in the forests, *O. cyaneum* and *E. lonnbergi* were isotopically more enriched than *Ap. caliginosa*

and had no overlap with the latter, whereas in the arable field, *Ap. caliginosa* is the most isotopically enriched species with apparent overlaps with the other two species. This dramatic difference can be explained by their feeding ecology: *O. cyaneum* and *E. lonnbergi*, which are larger than the other three species, are both mesohumic endogeic (feeding on soil more enriched in ^{13}C and ^{15}N), while the other three species, including *Ap. caliginosa*, are all polyhumic endogeic (feeding on soil less enriched in ^{13}C and ^{15}N). This isotopic difference between mesohumic and polyhumic endogeic species is clear evidence distinguishing these two ecological groups.

While considered as consuming either leaf litter or soil (or both), earthworms rely on different resources for food (Curry and Schmidt, 2007; Eissfeller et al., 2013; Ferlian et al., 2014; Larsen et al., 2016; Potapov et al., 2019c, 2022). Higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in endogeic species compared to litter-feeding species have been attributed to feeding more on microbially processed soil organic matter, on microbial residues, or on microorganisms themselves (Potapov et al., 2019b, c, 2022). Using compound-specific stable isotope analysis (CSIA) of fatty acids, Ferlian et al. (2014) reported that fatty acid $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ profile of *Ap. caliginosa* was closer to fungi than to bacteria, and associated this finding with the assimilation of recalcitrant carbon sources by this species. In contrast, using CSIA of amino acids to infer trophic levels, Potapov et al. (2019c) concluded that *Ap. caliginosa* relies equally on both plant material and microorganisms. So far, the endogeic species included in previous CSIA were all polyhumic (*Ap. caliginosa*, *Ap. rosea*, *Al. chlorotica*, and *O. lacteum*) (Ferlian et al., 2014; Larsen et al., 2016; Potapov et al., 2019c). However, no mesohumic endogeic species have ever been investigated. Given that mesohumic endogeic species are more enriched in ^{13}C and ^{15}N , we expect these species to rely more on soil microbes and microbially processed soil organic matter for food.

Aporrectodea caliginosa and *Ap. trapezoides* are two closely related species that, for decades, had long been believed to be ecomorphs of the same species, and were only recently confirmed to be evolutionarily distinct (Perez-Losada et al., 2009; Fernandez et al., 2012). Our SEA_B analysis demonstrated niche partitioning between the two species for the first time, with relatively low isotopic niche overlaps at ABANDONED1 and ARABLE1, where the two species coexisted. Moreover, the higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in *Ap. caliginosa* compared to those in *Ap. trapezoides* at the two sites is clear evidence that *Ap. caliginosa* consumes higher proportions of soil organic matter and microorganisms in its diet (Potapov et al., 2019c) compared to its close relative *Ap. trapezoides*.

4.2 Generalists and specialists

Chang et al. (2016b, 2021) proposed that under the context of ongoing invasion of jumping worms in North American forests, *M. hilgendorfi*, an epi-endogeic species, might be a stronger competitor against *L. rubellus* because the former, a “generalist”, occupied a larger isotopic niche and is capable of using a wider range of resources, which help them quickly increase in abundance and spread. In contrast, *L. rubellus*, another epi-endogeic species, has a smaller isotopic niche and is thus a “specialist” in a relative sense. It remains to be seen whether the two species will coexist in the long term (Chang et al., 2021). At ABANDONED1, we found a similar isotopic pattern among the three polyhumic endogeic species —*Al. chlorotica* occupied a relatively large isotopic niche area and was thus a generalist, whereas *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. trapezoides* had narrower isotopic niche breadths and could both be considered as specialists. However, based on our knowledge about the three species and the earthworm fauna in the region, *Al. chlorotica* does not appear to be a

strong competitor. It was never the dominant species in an earthworm community. Theory predicts that specialists perform better than generalists in their narrower niches, which may provide a potential mechanism for species coexistence (Futuyma and Moreno, 1988; Wilson and Yoshimura, 1994). Nevertheless, the coexistence of three polyhumic endogeic species at ABANDONED1 suggests that the polyhumic endogeic isotopic space may host as many as three coexisting species, including two specialists and one generalist.

4.3 Isotopic niche space occupied by earthworms

Taken together, species analyzed in this study demonstrated at least nine potential isotopic niches of earthworms in the two-dimensional space delimited by ^{13}C and ^{15}N (Fig. 6). At the lower-left of this two-dimensional space are two isotopic niches represented by the litter-feeding epi-endogeic “specialist” *L. rubellus* and the litter-feeding epi-endogeic “generalist” *M. hilgendorfi*, with the latter occupying a relatively larger niche space. Moving further towards higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values are three polyhumic endogeic species, including a “generalist” represented by *Al. chlorotica* and two “specialists” represented by *Ap. trapezoides* and *Ap. caliginosa*. Among them, *Al. chlorotica* has the largest isotopic niche, whereas *Ap. caliginosa* is isotopically more enriched than *Ap. trapezoides*. At the upper-right of the isotopic space are two mesohumic endogeic species, *E. lonnbergi* and *O. cyaneum*. They are isotopically separated from each other and are more enriched than the polyhumic endogeic species. As for anecic species, depending on the relative amount of soil versus leaf litter they consume, their isotopic niches can be similar to either epi-endogeic species, as in the anecic species *L. terrestris*, or to polyhumic endogeic species, as in *L. friendi*. Interestingly, compared to other species, the native endogeic species *Di. caroliniana* has

apparently lower $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values. This can indicate a stronger C_3 signal that resulted from selectively feeding on forbs growing in the abandoned arable fields.

In terms of trophic position of earthworm species, the stable isotope approach highlighted an ecological diversity that is greater than generally perceived under the three simple groups—epigeic, endogeic, and anecic. Among the 10 species we analyzed, some species are isotopically distinct from each other, while others overlap almost entirely, with the only apparent difference being their isotopic niche sizes. Altogether, these species form a continuum of trophic diversity, with no clear boundary between adjacent species in many cases. This observation supports the idea that as opposed to being categorical, earthworm species form an ecological continuum with no clear boundary or gap between the commonly recognized "ecological groups" (i.e. epigeic, endogeic, anecic, etc.). This continuum, though often overlooked in modern literature, has been pointed out a long time ago by Lee (1959) and Bouché (1972, 1977), and recently by Bottinelli et al. (2020).

It is noteworthy that not all niche spaces exist at the same time in the same habitat. Some niche spaces are missing, presumably, due to the absence of the corresponding resources, as in the case of missing mesohumic endogeic species in arable fields. Additionally, the observed isotopic niches can be considered realized niches shaped by environmental factors, resources, and interspecific interactions. A species' position in the isotopic niche space can change from one habitat to another or even within the same habitat over time, either seasonally or at different developmental stages (Schmidt, 1999; Schmidt et al., 1999; Neilson et al., 2000; Chang et al., 2016b).

It remains to be seen how epigeic species and oligohumic endogeic species fit into the framework of the ^{13}C and ^{15}N -delimited isotopic niches. One would expect epigeic species to be less enriched in ^{13}C and ^{15}N compared to epi-endogeic species, such as *L. rubellus*. However, Potapov et al. (2019c) found that *Dendrobaena octaedra* (Savigny, 1826), a commonly recognized epigeic species, relied more on bacteria and fungi for food and was more enriched in ^{13}C and ^{15}N compared to the epi-endogeic species *L. rubellus*. They attributed this isotopic signature to the wood-feeding behavior of *De. octaedra* at their study sites. In addition to *De. octaedra*, several epigeic species common in temperate North America and Europe, such as *Bimastos rubidus* (Savigny, 1826) and *Bimastos parvus* (Eisen, 1874), are known to be associated with decomposing wood (Csuzdi et al., 2017). In fact, a number of species live outside of the typical soil profiles, making them even more difficult to fit into the commonly used ecological categories. These species are often characterized by the microhabitat and/or environmental conditions in which they occur. While also called ecological strategies (Lee, 1985) or ecological types (Wetzel and Reynolds, 2021), terms such as corticolous (living under logs or under barks) and limicolous (living in very wet habitats) provide very little information on the ecological function of these species. There are also epigeic species living primarily under leaf litter, such as *Lumbricus castaneus* (Savigny, 1826) and *Eisenoides carolinensis* (Michaelsen, 1910). Thus, how these two different groups of epigeic earthworms fit into the current picture of isotopic niche space remains to be explored. The same can be applied to oligohumic endogeic species, which is not a common member of earthworm communities in forests and arable fields in temperate North America and Europe, and was not included in our analysis.

4.4 Distinct isotopic niches of native North American species

The majority of earthworm species analyzed in this study were of European origin and introduced into North America. However, two native species, *E. lonnbergi* and *Di. caroliniana*, were present in the earthworm communities we sampled. Combining isotopic labeling and feeding experiment, Chang et al. (2016b) showed that the native *E. lonnbergi* occupies a unique isotopic niche, which allows for its coexistence with both European and Asian invasive species. Our results further demonstrated that the unique feeding habits of the native species *Di. caroliniana* may allow for its coexistence with invasive European species in human-disturbed habitats, such as arable fields. Isotopic niches of native earthworm species, especially in relation to ongoing earthworm invasions in many habitats globally, is a major knowledge gap, yet this type of information is crucial in our ability to predict the outcome of interaction between native and non-native species.

4.5 Ecological groups of earthworms revisited

The isotopic results provided clear evidence why we opted to use Perel and Lavelle's ecological categorization (Perel, 1975; Lavelle, 1981) when describing our data: it is relatively straightforward and easy to comprehend when applied to the species we analyzed. For instance, *Al. chlorotica* is a small endogeic species living in surface soil, whereas *O. cyaneum* is a slow-moving, medium-sized endogeic species living a little deeper in the soil. The two species have distinct isotopic signatures. In Perel and Lavelle's system, *O. cyaneum* is a mesohumic endogeic species and *Al. chlorotica* is a polyhumic endogeic species. However, in Bouché's system, the two ecologically distinct species belong to the same group, called "intermediate" (Bottinelli et al., 2020). This group name carries little ecological information. Similarly, *Ap. caliginosa*, *Aporrectodea rosea* (Savigny, 1826), and *Octolasion lacteum* (Örley, 1881) are all light-colored, small-bodied earthworms that can be found living

in shallow soils in temperate deciduous forests in North America and Europe. In Bouché's system, *Ap. caliginosa* and *Ap. rosea* are endogeic. However, *O. lacteum* is endo-anecic (Bottinelli et al., 2020), a confusing terminology that, for most earthworm ecologists, implies large body size and building vertical burrows deep in the soil.

Regardless of whether Bouché's or Perel and Lavelle's categorization is used, there are ample examples in which a species does not fit well into any categories. For example, *Octodrilus transpadanus* (Rosa, 1884), a widely distributed trans-Aegean species with medium to large body size and dark gray pigmentation, is usually considered an endogeic species (Csuzdi and Zicsi, 2003; Domínguez et al., 2015). This species can be found in meadows, riparian forests, and deciduous forests. In deciduous forests, it builds litter middens typical for anecic species. Also, its cast deposition pattern is very similar to that of the anecic species *Dendrobaena depressa* (Rosa, 1893) (Zicsi et al., 2011). In Central Europe, especially in the Apuseni Mts. (Romania), there are several similar *Octodrilus* species that lack the typical purple-red pigmentation of an anecic species but feed on leaf litter and deposit a large amount of excrement on the soil surface (Pop and Postolache, 1987). Another good example is *Allolobophora robusta* Rosa, 1895, a large-bodied Balkanic species regarded as endogeic. However, it is dark-gray pigmented and usually lives in deciduous forests where it builds permanent burrows and defecates on the soil surface, similarly to the large, anecic *Scherotheca* species of France (Domínguez et al., 2015). These examples demonstrate that there are various limitations of the traditional categorization, and highlight that a refined version of the original two systems is needed to accommodate more earthworm species.

4.6 Stable isotopic signatures as quantitative functional traits

662

663 The stable isotope approach has strengths as well as limitations. One obvious strength is
664 that it is quantitative, and uses a standard procedure for collecting data and analyzing them.
665 This should allow for comparisons across different sites and habitats, as well as facilitate the
666 accumulation of data and meta-analyses. A major caveat is that it requires a reference
667 material for standardization. This material is usually leaf litter, the presumed basal food
668 resource type in a given habitat. However, seasonal variations in detritus input can make
669 collecting representative leaf litter samples a tricky task, as is the case in our study.
670 Additionally, the use of leaf litter as reference material ignores legacies from past land use
671 and variations of belowground carbon input from roots in different types of vegetation.

672

673 With only a few exceptions (Uchida et al., 2004; Hyodo et al., 2008, 2012), isotope
674 analyses of earthworms have only been applied to a handful of common peregrine species,
675 mostly Lumbricidae of European origin. It remains to be seen if native species from around
676 the world, such as pheretimoids in East and Southeast Asia, Glossoscolecidae and
677 Rhinodrilidae in Central and South Americas, Eudrilidae in tropical Africa, and
678 Acanthodrilidae and Megascolecidae in New Zealand and Australia, will show patterns
679 consistent with those we observed in non-native species in North America.

680

681 Our study echoes calls for a trait-based approach to revisiting earthworm ecological
682 groups (Bottinelli et al., 2020). We further propose that an isotopic database or including
683 stable isotope data in a trait database is crucial for our fundamental understanding on species-
684 specific earthworm ecology and for revising earthworm ecological groups. Stable isotope
685 signatures can be considered as biochemical or trophic traits (i.e., estimators of diet) (Potapov
686 et al., 2020). They are influenced by both environmental factors and biotic interactions, vary

intraspecifically, and thus can serve as a proxy to understand the flexibility within a species. We agree that earthworm ecological groups are not functional groups (Bottinelli and Capowiez, 2021), but we need ecological categories that also help us understand the associated ecological processes and establish the mechanistic links between earthworm community structure and ecosystem function. The stable isotopes of carbon and nitrogen integrate earthworm feeding and burrowing behaviors and the temporal and spatial signals within a timeframe of several weeks or even months. These signals not only can serve as a proxy for food resource use of earthworms, but also are inherently related to the carbon and nitrogen biogeochemistry in the soil, and thus may provide insights into how earthworms affect soil C and N cycles. In addition to C and N stable isotopes, other functional traits (morphological, behavioral, physiological, and biochemical) can be added into this framework to turn the two-dimensional isotopic niche space into a multidimensional niche space (Potapov et al., 2021).

5. Conclusions

Using stable isotopes of carbon and nitrogen, we demonstrated that earthworms commonly found in arable fields and temperate deciduous forests in North America occupied nine isotopic niches, ranging from species feeding primarily on leaf litter to species feeding on microbially-processed soil organic matter. Although the observed isotopic patterns are, in general, consistent with the three commonly used ecological categories (epigeic, endogeic, and anecic) and with Perel and Lavelle's more refined system, the species, altogether, form an isotopic niche continuum with considerable overlaps between species of different ecological groups, especially between trophic specialists and generalists. Additionally, along this across-group isotopic niche continuum, species within the same ecological group can

exhibit considerable isotopic niche differentiation and resource partitioning. We propose that C and N stable isotopes should be incorporated as functional traits when studying earthworm ecological groups. It remains to be seen if the nine isotopic niches identified herein will be recovered when the same approach is applied to native earthworms in different taxonomic groups and biogeographical regions, and how well the outcomes can be generalized, but we are optimistic.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this study was provided by the National Science Foundation (NSF-DEB 120894) to K. Szlavecz and by the Ministry of Education, Taiwan (Yushan Scholar Program) and the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan (MOST108-2621-B-002-001-MY3) to C.-H. Chang. Thanks to Michel Cavigelli (USDA BARC), John Parker (SERC), and Pat Megonigal (SERC) for permission to sample at the sites. We are grateful to Adam Dec, Zachary Ferguson, Kelly Baker, and Jacob Rode for their help in the field and in the lab.

References

Blondel, J., 2003. Guilds or functional groups: does it matter? *Oikos* 100, 223–231.

736 Bluhm, S.L., Potapov, A.M., Shrubovych, J., Ammerschubert, S., Polle, A., Scheu, S., 2019.
 737 Protura are unique: first evidence of specialized feeding on ectomycorrhizal fungi in
 738 soil invertebrates. *BMC Ecology* 19.
 739 Bohlen, P.J., Scheu, S., Hale, C.M., McLean, M.A., Migge, S., Groffman, P.M., Parkinson,
 740 D., 2004. Non-native invasive earthworms as agents of change in northern temperate
 741 forests. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2, 427–435.
 742 Bottinelli, N., Capowiez, Y., 2021. Earthworm ecological categories are not functional
 743 groups. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 57, 329–331.
 744 Bottinelli, N., Hedde, M., Jouquet, P., Capowiez, Y., 2020. An explicit definition of
 745 earthworm ecological categories - Marcel Bouche's triangle revisited. *Geoderma* 372.
 746 Bouché, M.B., 1972. *Lombriciens de France. Écologie et Systématique*. Institut National de
 747 la Recherche Agronomique, Dijon, France.
 748 Bouché, M.B., 1977. Strategies lombriciennes, In: Lohm, U., Persson, T. (Eds.), *Soil*
 749 *organisms as components of ecosystems*. Ecological Bulletins Stockholm, pp. 122–132.
 750 Briones, M.J.I., Alvarez-Otero, R., 2018. Body wall thickness as a potential functional trait
 751 for assigning earthworm species to ecological categories. *Pedobiologia* 67, 26–34.
 752 Briones, M.J.I., Bol, R., Sleep, D., Allen, D., Sampedro, L., 2001. Spatio-temporal variation
 753 of stable isotope ratios in earthworms under grassland and maize cropping systems.
 754 *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 33, 1673–1682.
 755 Brown, G.G., 1995. How do earthworms affect microfloral and faunal community diversity.
 756 *Plant and Soil* 170, 209–231.
 757 Cavigelli, M.A., Teasdale, J.R., Conklin, A.E., 2008. Long-term agronomic performance of
 758 organic and conventional field crops in the mid-Atlantic region. *Agronomy Journal*
 759 100, 785–794.

760 Chang, C.-H., Bartz, M.L.C., Brown, G., Callaham, M.A., Cameron, E.K., Davalos, A.,
 761 Dobson, A., Gorres, J.H., Herrick, B.M., Ikeda, H., James, S.W., Johnston, M.R.,
 762 McCay, T.S., McHugh, D., Minamiya, Y., Nouri-Aiin, M., Novo, M., Ortiz-Pachar, J.,
 763 Pinder, R.A., Ransom, T., Richardson, J.B., Snyder, B.A., Szlavecz, K., 2021. The
 764 second wave of earthworm invasions in North America: biology, environmental
 765 impacts, management and control of invasive jumping worms. *Biological Invasions* 23,
 766 3291–3322.

767 Chang, C.-H., Szlavecz, K., Buyer, J.S., 2016a. Species-specific effects of earthworms on
 768 microbial communities and the fate of litter-derived carbon. *Soil Biology &*
 769 *Biochemistry* 100, 129–139.

770 Chang, C.-H., Szlavecz, K., Buyer, J.S., 2017. *Amyntas agrestis* invasion increases
 771 microbial biomass in Mid-Atlantic deciduous forests. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*
 772 114, 189–199.

773 Chang, C.-H., Szlavecz, K., Filley, T., Buyer, J.S., Bernard, M.J., Pitz, S.L., 2016b.
 774 Belowground competition among invading detritivores. *Ecology* 97, 160–170.

775 Craven, D., Thakur, M.P., Cameron, E.K., Frelich, L.E., Beausejour, R., Blair, R.B., Blossey,
 776 B., Burtis, J., Choi, A., Davalos, A., Fahey, T.J., Fisichelli, N.A., Gibson, K., Handa,
 777 I.T., Hopfensperger, K., Loss, S.R., Nuzzo, V., Maerz, J.C., Sackett, T., Scharenbroch,
 778 B.C., Smith, S.M., Vellend, M., Umek, L.G., Eisenhauer, N., 2017. The unseen
 779 invaders: introduced earthworms as drivers of change in plant communities in North
 780 American forests (a meta-analysis). *Global Change Biology* 23, 1065–1074.

781 Csuzdi, C., Chang, C.H., Pavlicek, T., Szederjesi, T., Esopi, D., Szlavecz, K., 2017.
 782 Molecular phylogeny and systematics of native North American lumbricid earthworms
 783 (Clitellata: Megadrili). *Plos One* 12.

784 Csuzdi, C., Zicsi, A., 2003. Earthworms of Hungary. Hungarian Natural History Museum,
785 Budepast.

786 Curry, J.P., Schmidt, O., 2007. The feeding ecology of earthworms - A review. *Pedobiologia*
787 50, 463–477.

788 Dominguez, J., Aira, M., Breinholt, J.W., Stojanovic, M., James, S.W., Perez-Losada, M.,
789 2015. Underground evolution: New roots for the old tree of lumbricid earthworms.
790 *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 83, 7–19.

791 Edwards, C.A., Bohlen, P.J., 1996. *Biology and ecology of earthworms*, 3rd ed. Chapman &
792 Hall, London.

793 Eissfeller, V., Beyer, F., Valtanen, K., Hertel, D., Maraun, M., Polle, A., Scheu, S., 2013.
794 Incorporation of plant carbon and microbial nitrogen into the rhizosphere food web of
795 beech and ash. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 62, 76–81.

796 Ferlian, O., Cesarz, S., Marhan, S., Scheu, S., 2014. Carbon food resources of earthworms of
797 different ecological groups as indicated by ^{13}C compound-specific stable isotope
798 analysis. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 77, 22–30.

799 Ferlian, O., Eisenhauer, N., Aguirrebengoa, M., Camara, M., Ramirez-Rojas, I., Santos, F.,
800 Tanalgo, K., Thakur, M.P., 2018. Invasive earthworms erode soil biodiversity: A meta-
801 analysis. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 87, 162–172.

802 Ferlian, O., Klärner, B., Langeneckert, A.E., Scheu, S., 2015. Trophic niche differentiation
803 and utilisation of food resources in collembolans based on complementary analyses of
804 fatty acids and stable isotopes. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 82, 28–35.

805 Ferlian, O., Thakur, M.P., Gonzalez, A.C., San Emeterio, L.M., Marr, S., Rocha, B.D.,
806 Eisenhauer, N., 2020. Soil chemistry turned upside down: a meta-analysis of invasive
807 earthworm effects on soil chemical properties. *Ecology* 101, 12.

808 Fernandez, R., Almodovar, A., Novo, M., Simancas, B., Diaz Cosin, D.J., 2012. Adding
 809 complexity to the complex: New insights into the phylogeny, diversification and origin
 810 of parthenogenesis in the *Aporrectodea caliginosa* species complex (Oligochaeta,
 811 Lumbricidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 64, 368–379.

812 Frelich, L.E., Blossey, B., Cameron, E.K., Davalos, A., Eisenhauer, N., Fahey, T., Ferlian,
 813 O., Groffman, P.M., Larson, E., Loss, S.R., Maerz, J.C., Nuzzo, V., Yoo, K., Reich,
 814 P.B., 2019. Side-swiped: ecological cascades emanating from earthworm invasions.
 815 *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 17, 502–510.

816 Frouz, J., Liveckova, M., Albrechtova, J., Chronakova, A., Cajthaml, T., Pizl, V., Hanel, L.,
 817 Stary, J., Baldrian, P., Lhotakova, Z., Simackova, H., Cepakova, S., 2013. Is the effect
 818 of trees on soil properties mediated by soil fauna? A case study from post-mining sites.
 819 *Forest Ecology and Management* 309, 87–95.

820 Futuyma, D.J., Moreno, G., 1988. The evolution of ecological specialization. *Annual Review*
 821 *of Ecology and Systematics* 19, 207–233.

822 Gongalsky, K.B., Persson, T., 2013. Recovery of soil macrofauna after wildfires in boreal
 823 forests. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 57, 182–191.

824 Huang, W., Gonzalez, G., Zou, X.M., 2020. Earthworm abundance and functional group
 825 diversity regulate plant litter decay and soil organic carbon level: A global meta-
 826 analysis. *Applied Soil Ecology* 150.

827 Hyodo, F., Kohzu, A., Tayasu, I., 2010. Linking aboveground and belowground food webs
 828 through carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analyses. *Ecological Research* 25, 745–756.

829 Hyodo, F., Tayasu, I., Konate, S., Tondoh, J.E., Lavelle, P., Wada, E., 2008. Gradual
 830 enrichment of ^{15}N with humification of diets in a below-ground food web: relationship
 831 between ^{15}N and diet age determined using ^{14}C . *Functional Ecology* 22, 516–522.

832 Hyodo, F., Uchida, T., Kaneko, N., Tayasu, I., 2012. Use of radiocarbon to estimate diet ages
833 of earthworms across different climate regions. *Applied Soil Ecology* 62, 178–183.

834 Jackson, A.L., Inger, R., Parnell, A.C., Bearhop, S., 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths
835 among and within communities: SIBER - Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R.
836 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 80, 595–602.

837 Klärner, B., Ehnes, R.B., Erdmann, G., Eitzinger, B., Pollierer, M.M., Maraun, M., Scheu, S.,
838 2014. Trophic shift of soil animal species with forest type as indicated by stable isotope
839 analysis. *Oikos* 123, 1173–1181.

840 Kudrin, A.A., Tsurikov, S.M., Tiunov, A.V., 2015. Trophic position of microbivorous and
841 predatory soil nematodes in a boreal forest as indicated by stable isotope analysis. *Soil*
842 *Biology & Biochemistry* 86, 193–200.

843 Larsen, T., Pollierer, M.M., Holmstrup, M., D'Annibale, A., Maraldo, K., Andersen, N.,
844 Eriksen, J., 2016. Substantial nutritional contribution of bacterial amino acids to
845 earthworms and enchytraeids: A case study from organic grasslands. *Soil Biology &*
846 *Biochemistry* 99, 21–27.

847 Lavelle, P., 1981. Strategies de reproduction chez les vers de terre. *Acta Oecol-Oec. Gen.* 2,
848 117–133.

849 Lee, K.E., 1959. The earthworm fauna of New Zealand. New Zealand Department of
850 Scientific and Industrial Research Bulletin 130, 486 pp.

851 Lee, K.E., 1985. Earthworms: their ecology and relationships with soils and land use.
852 Academic Press, Sydney.

853 Lubbers, I.M., van Groenigen, K.J., Fonte, S.J., Six, J., Brussaard, L., van Groenigen, J.W.,
854 2013. Greenhouse-gas emissions from soils increased by earthworms. *Nature Climate*
855 *Change* 3, 187–194.

856 Maraun, M., Erdmann, G., Fischer, B.M., Pollierer, M.M., Norton, R.A., Schneider, K.,
857 Scheu, S., 2011. Stable isotopes revisited: Their use and limits for oribatid mite trophic
858 ecology. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 43, 877–882.

859 Melody, C., Griffiths, B., Dyckmans, J., Schmidt, O., 2016. Stable isotope analysis ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and
860 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) of soil nematodes from four feeding groups. *Peerj* 4.

861 Melody, C., Schmidt, O., 2012. Northward range extension of an endemic soil decomposer
862 with a distinct trophic position. *Biology Letters* 8, 956–959.

863 Neilson, R., Boag, B., Smith, M., 2000. Earthworm $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ analyses suggest that
864 putative functional classifications of earthworms are site-specific and may also indicate
865 habitat diversity. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 32, 1053–1061.

866 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P., O'hara, R., Simpson, G.,
867 Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Wagner, H., 2013. Community ecology package. R
868 package version 2.

869 Örley, L., 1885. A Palaearktikus övben élő terrikoláknak revisiója és elterjedése. *Értekezések*
870 *a természettudományok köréből* 15, 1–34.

871 Perel, T.S., 1975. Lifeforms of Lumbricidae. *J. Gen. Biol. Moscow* 36, 189–202.

872 Perez-Losada, M., Ricoy, M., Marshall, J.C., Dominguez, J., 2009. Phylogenetic assessment
873 of the earthworm *Aporrectodea caliginosa* species complex (Oligochaeta:
874 Lumbricidae) based on mitochondrial and nuclear DNA sequences. *Molecular*
875 *Phylogenetics and Evolution* 52, 293–302.

876 Pollierer, M.M., Langel, R., Scheu, S., Maraun, M., 2009. Compartmentalization of the soil
877 animal food web as indicated by dual analysis of stable isotope ratios ($^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$ and
878 $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$). *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 41, 1221–1226.

879 Pop, V.V., Postolache, T., 1987. Giant earthworms build up vermic mountain rendzinas, In:
880 Bonvicini Pagliai, A., Omodeo, P. (Eds.), *On earthworms*, Mucchi, Italy, pp. 141–150.

881 Porco, D., Chang, C.H., Dupont, L., James, S., Richard, B., Decaens, T., 2018. A reference
882 library of DNA barcodes for the earthworms from Upper Normandy: Biodiversity
883 assessment, new records, potential cases of cryptic diversity and ongoing speciation.
884 *Applied Soil Ecology* 124, 362–371.

885 Porco, D., Decaens, T., Deharveng, L., James, S.W., Skarzynski, D., Erseus, C., Butt, K.R.,
886 Richard, B., Hebert, P.D.N., 2013. Biological invasions in soil: DNA barcoding as a
887 monitoring tool in a multiple taxa survey targeting European earthworms and
888 springtails in North America. *Biological Invasions* 15, 899–910.

889 Potapov, A.A., Semenina, E.E., Korotkevich, A.Y., Kuznetsova, N.A., Tiunov, A.V., 2016.
890 Connecting taxonomy and ecology: Trophic niches of collembolans as related to
891 taxonomic identity and life forms. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 101, 20–31.

892 Potapov, A.M., Beaulieu, F., Birkhofer, K., Bluhm, S.L., Degtyarev, M.I., Devetter, M.,
893 Goncharov, A.A., Gongalsky, K.B., Klarner, B., Korobushkin, D.I., 2022. Feeding
894 habits and multifunctional classification of soil- associated consumers from protists to
895 vertebrates. *Biological Reviews*.

896 Potapov, A.M., Pollierer, M.M., Salmon, S., Šustr, V., Chen, T.W., 2021. Multidimensional
897 trophic niche revealed by complementary approaches: Gut content, digestive enzymes,
898 fatty acids and stable isotopes in Collembola. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 90, 1919–
899 1933.

900 Potapov, A.M., Scheu, S., Tiunov, A.V., 2019a. Trophic consistency of supraspecific taxa in
901 below-ground invertebrate communities: Comparison across lineages and taxonomic
902 ranks. *Functional Ecology* 33, 1172–1183.

903 Potapov, A.M., Tiunov, A.V., Scheu, S., 2019b. Uncovering trophic positions and food
904 resources of soil animals using bulk natural stable isotope composition. *Biological*
905 *Reviews* 94, 37–59.

906 Potapov, A.M., Tiunov, A.V., Scheu, S., Larsen, T., Pollierer, M.M., 2019c. Combining bulk
907 and amino acid stable isotope analyses to quantify trophic level and basal resources of
908 detritivores: a case study on earthworms. *Oecologia* 189, 447–460.

909 Scheu, S., Falca, M., 2000. The soil food web of two beech forests (*Fagus sylvatica*) of
910 contrasting humus type: stable isotope analysis of a macro- and a mesofauna-dominated
911 community. *Oecologia* 123, 285–296.

912 Schmidt, O., 1999. Intrapopulation variation in carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios in
913 the earthworm *Aporrectodea longa*. *Ecological Research* 14, 317–328.

914 Schmidt, O., Curry, J.P., Dyckmans, J., Rota, E., Scrimgeour, C.M., 2004. Dual stable
915 isotope analysis ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) of soil invertebrates and their food sources.
916 *Pedobiologia* 48, 171–180.

917 Schmidt, O., Scrimgeour, C.M., Curry, J.P., 1999. Carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios
918 in body tissue and mucus of feeding and fasting earthworms (*Lumbricus festivus*).
919 *Oecologia* 118, 9–15.

920 Schmidt, O., Scrimgeour, C.M., Handley, L.L., 1997. Natural abundance of ^{15}N and ^{13}C in
921 earthworms from a wheat and a wheat-clover field. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 29,
922 1301–1308.

923 Sizmur, T., Richardson, J., 2020. Earthworms accelerate the biogeochemical cycling of
924 potentially toxic elements: Results of a meta-analysis. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*
925 148.

926 Szlavecz, K., Chang, C.H., Bernard, M.J., Pitz, S.L., Xia, L.J., Ma, Y.N., McCormick, M.K.,
927 Filley, T., Yarwood, S.A., Yesilonis, I.D., Csuzdi, C., 2018. Litter quality, dispersal
928 and invasion drive earthworm community dynamics and forest soil development.
929 *Oecologia* 188, 237–250.

930 Szlavecz, K., McCormick, M., Xia, L., Saunders, J., Morcol, T., Whigham, D., Filley, T.,
931 Csuzdi, C., 2011. Ecosystem effects of non-native earthworms in Mid-Atlantic
932 deciduous forests. *Biological Invasions* 13, 1165–1182.

933 Taheri, S., Pelosi, C., Dupont, L., 2018. Harmful or useful? A case study of the exotic
934 peregrine earthworm morphospecies *Pontoscolex corethrurus*. *Soil Biology &*
935 *Biochemistry* 116, 277–289.

936 R Core Team, 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
937 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

938 Uchida, T., Kaneko, N., Ito, M.T., Futagami, K., Sasaki, T., Sugimoto, A., 2004. Analysis of
939 the feeding ecology of earthworms (Megascolecidae) in Japanese forests using gut
940 content fractionation and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ stable isotope natural abundances. *Applied*
941 *Soil Ecology* 27, 153–163.

942 van Groenigen, J.W., Lubbers, I.M., Vos, H.M.J., Brown, G.G., De Deyn, G.B., van
943 Groenigen, K.J., 2014. Earthworms increase plant production: a meta-analysis.
944 *Scientific Reports* 4.

945 Van Groenigen, J.W., Van Groenigen, K.J., Koopmans, G.F., Stokkermans, L., Vos, H.M.J.,
946 Lubbers, I.M., 2019. How fertile are earthworm casts? A meta-analysis. *Geoderma*
947 338, 525–535.

948 Voigt, W., Perner, J., Jones, T.H., 2007. Using functional groups to investigate community
949 response to environmental changes: two grassland case studies. *Global Change*
950 *Biology* 13, 1710–1721.

951 Wetzal, M.J., J.W., R., 2021. A preliminary inventory of earthworms (Annelida, Clitellata) of
952 the Nachusa Grasslands Area, Lee and Ogle Counties, Illinois, USA. *Megadrilologica*
953 26, 91–124.

- 954 Wilson, D.S., Yoshimura, J., 1994. On the coexistence of specialists and generalists.
955 American Naturalist 144, 692–707.
- 956 Wilson, J.B., 1999. Guilds, functional types and ecological groups. Oikos 86, 507–522.
- 957 Xiao, Z.G., Wang, X., Koricheva, J., Kergunteuil, A., Le Bayon, R.C., Liu, M.Q., Hu, F.,
958 Rasmann, S., 2018. Earthworms affect plant growth and resistance against herbivores:
959 A meta-analysis. Functional Ecology 32, 150–160.
- 960 Zicsi, A., Szlavecz, K., Csuzdi, C., 2011. Leaf litter acceptance and cast deposition by
961 peregrine and endemic European lumbricids (Oligochaeta: Lumbricidae).
962 Pedobiologia 54, S145–S152.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Ecological groups of earthworms proposed by Perel (1975) and Lavelle (1981). In this system, earthworms are categorized into six groups that differ in body size, feeding and burrowing behaviors, and position (depth) in the soil, as illustrated in this diagram. Epigeic species are litter feeders living in the leaf litter. Epi-endogeic species are primarily litter feeders living in the litter-soil interface. They are found not only in the litter but also in surface soil. Anecic species are large-bodied litter feeders living in permanent vertical burrows deep in the soil. Polyhumic endogeic species are primarily soil feeders living in surface soil and feeding on fresh soil organic matter, such as root-derived resources. Mesohumic endogeic species feed on processed soil organic matter, live deeper than polyhumic species in the soil, and are also larger in size. Oligohumic endogeic species feed on highly processed soil organic matter. They are large and live deep in the soil.

Fig. 2. Stable isotope ratios ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) of soil samples at the five study sites. Black points and error bars represent the means and standard errors; original data points are shown in gray. Note the different ranges on the x axes. Y axes are not to scale.

Fig. 3. Stable isotope ratios ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) of earthworm species at the study sites ABANDONED1, ABANDONED2, and ARABLE1. Ovals are Bayesian standard ellipse areas (SEA_B) representing the core isotopic niches of each species. Black points and error bars represent the means and standard errors of the stable isotope ratios of soil samples at 0-5 and 5-10 cm depth. The isotope ratios of earthworm samples were standardized using background soil


isotope signatures (see Materials and Methods for more details). Note that there is no oval for *Diplocardia caroliniana* because of insufficient sample size for computation of SEA_B .


Fig. 4. The percentage of the SEA_B of species A that overlaps with the SEA_B of species B at the study sites ABANDONED1, ABANDONED2, and ARABLE1 (see also Appendix S1: Table S3 for the numerical results).

Fig. 5. Stable isotope ratios ($\delta^{13}C$ and $\delta^{15}N$) of earthworm species at the study sites FOREST1 and FOREST2. Ovals are Bayesian standard ellipse areas (SEA_B) representing the core isotopic niches of each species. Black points and error bars represent the means and standard errors of the stable isotope ratios of soil samples at 0-5 and 5-10 cm depth. The isotope ratios of earthworm samples were standardized using background soil isotope signatures (see Materials and Methods for more details). Note that there is no oval for *Lumbricus terrestris* because of insufficient sample sizes for computation of SEA_B . Data from Chang et al. (2016). Replotted using soil for standardization.

Fig. 6. The carbon and nitrogen isotope discrimination ($\Delta^{13}C$ and $\Delta^{15}N$) between the soil and earthworm species across the five study sites. Points and error bars represent the means and standard errors of $\Delta^{13}C$ and $\Delta^{15}N$. Total sample size $N = 251$.

Figure 1









Figure 4

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 4.jpg](#)



[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 5.jpg](#)








Figure 6





[Click here to access/download](#)

Supplementary Material for online publication only
Appendix S1.docx



Declaration of interests

☒The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: