**Title:**

**Something for nothing: a synthesis of active versus passive restoration in drylands.**

**Authors:** M. Florencia Miguel1\*, H. Scott Butterfield2 and Christopher J. Lortie3

**Affiliations:**

1Instituto Argentino de Investigaciones de las Zonas Áridas (UNCuyo-Gobierno de Mendoza-CONICET), Mendoza, Argentina.

2The Nature Conservancy, San Francisco, CA, United States of America.

3Department of Biology, YorkU, and NCEAS, UCSB.

\*Correspondence to: fmiguel@conicet-mendoza.gob.ar

**Abstract:**

Restoration is a fundamental priority globally. Dryland ecosystems are biodiversity hotspots and ideal to explore different restoration strategies. These regions face serious threats due to agricultural intensification - is that true? I think ag was winding down and retirement was just as prominent? @Scott? if say, just say threats due to agriculture practices, ranching, energy developments? Or just leave at land degradation? and land degradation. Using drylands as a case study, a formal synthesis including meta-analyses contrasted two general restoration strategies, active versus passive, and specific techniques to examine restoration outcomes. This synthesis included research from 19 countries, described almost 25 interventions, and examined outcomes associated with habitats and different taxa. Active restoration practices yielded significant positive outcomes for soils, vegetation, and wildlife. Passive restoration was a viable option only for limited recovery of vegetation but not for soils. These findings suggest that direct interventions are critical in many ecosystems specially those experiencing severe anthropogenic pressures and environmental stress.

ABSTRACT STRONG. good.

**One Sentence Summary:**

Active restoration in dryland ecosystems globally yields positive ecological outcomes for soils, vegetation, and wildlife.

**Main Text:**

Restoration is a complex field of research and crucial in all ecosystems (*1*). The restoration of degraded ecosystem provide multiple benefits to people (*2*) including fundamental services as food and water (*3*). Consequently, functional and healthy ecosystems are indispensable for the sustainability of humanity and all other forms of life (*4*–*6*), and ecological restoration links the interface between people and nature (*7*, *8*). Active and passive restoration strategies typically differ in the resources invested such as time, money, and human assistance (*9*). These resources are likely to be scarce, and we need to identify interventions that generate consistent and positive outcomes that support enhanced ecosystem function and services. Dryland ecosystems are an exemplary case study to evaluate the effectiveness of restoration practices and encompass many habitats such as grasslands, shrublands, and deserts (*10*). Agricultural lands comprise almost 40% of the terrestrial surface on Earth and are present in all drylands with significant impacts (*11*, *12*). Drylands are hotspots of biodiversity supporting some of the most endangered species worldwide (e.g. large herbivores in Africa) (*13*). Furthermore, a wide variety of ecosystem services that contribute to the quality of life for people such (*14*) as food, water, energy, carbon sequestration, cultural identity and aesthetic values (*10*) are provided by drylands (*15*). However, dryland ecosystems are some of the most degraded systems in the world (*16*); the increasing land conversion (e.g. to agriculture), land degradation, and climate change (*17*) all threaten the delivery of ecosystem services (*14*). While increased land protection such as conservation easements (*18*) and better land management practices (*19*) will benefit remaining habitat in drylands, changing conditions and water scarcity in particular have created an opportunity to re-claim and restore degraded agricultural drylands for plants and wildlife (*19*, *20*). In order to seize the opportunity to restore dryland habitat, practitioners need clear guidance on the relative merit of restoration practices that have the greatest positive outcomes with most likely resource limitations.

To examine the success of restoration practices and their outcomes, we performed a meta-analysis of 40 peer-reviewed publications that compared experimental and control groups from 19 different countries in dryland ecosystems (Fig. 1). The data were extensive at more than 1400 independent interventions measured across all studies - accurate? or you could say 1400 independent instances - or use the term observations. Among the diverse disturbances reported in drylands globally (Fig. S1), we focused on restoration within retired agricultural lands on both farmland and grazed natural lands. Each restoration was broadly classified as either active defined as direct human assistance in the restoration process or passive whereby lands were left to natural recovery processes without additional intervetions (*21*) - accurate?. For each instance/observation/trial/intervention - @Scott - whatever you prefer - all mean the same, we also extracted response data outcomes for each specific restoration practice (*22*). The success of these restoration practices and outcomes was assessed using the log response ratio (lrr) (*23*). We grouped active restoration practices into the following three categories based on their primary focus: soil, vegetation, and water supply (Table 1A; Table S1). Soil, vegetation, and grazing exclusion were tested passively. Soil, vegetation, animals, and habitat interventions were examined directly as active restoration practices (Table 1B). The habitat classification was used for studies that reported measures of both soil and vegetation recovery?. We evaluated passive restoration outcomes across the same three categories: soil, vegetation, and habitat (Table 1B)?? confusing. We used random effects models to account for the variability within the studies evaluated (*24*), and then applied post hoc meta-regressions to test the potential influence of aridity (*25*) and duration of studies since restoration practice implementation - or not when passive - so maybe just say from onset of study?.

Active restoration consistently led to positive responses providing evidence for a commitment to active restoration strategies in planning management for drylands (Table 1). All three specific categories of active restoration had net positive responses (Table 1A, Fig. 2); water supplementation was the most effective restoration practice followed by soil then vegetation remediations (Table 1A, Fig. 2). Passive recovery of vegetation and grazing exclusion (i.e. passive because grazing removed and no other interventions applied) also had positive effects on defined restoration outcomes such as ... then just 1-2 of them (Table 1A, Fig. 2). Nonetheless, passive recovery outcomes had lower and more variable effect sizes, and this strategy for soils such as fallowing typically led to negative responses (Table 1A, Fig. 2). Aridity and duration of studies following implementation both significantly influenced the effectiveness of active restoration practices (lrr= -0.01, 95% CI= -0.02 to -0.01; lrr= 0.003, 95% CI= 0.003 to 0.0035, respectively) - ok - these kind of hang here a bit and the lrr values look really tiny - ie 0.003 so I recommend that you also add a short, short interpretation in the sentence instead of just stating it - Aridity had a weak negative impact on direct interventions suggesting that environmental limitations are critical drivers of change in these systems while increasing duration of study had a significant but minimal positive return suggesting longer studies and time-frames be considered (stats) - @Scott?? good?. Duration of recovery positively influenced passive strategies but variation in aridity was not generally relevant (lrr duration = 0.01, 95% CI= 0.008 to 0.01 and lrr aridity). Soils did not passively recover in drylands, but plants and habitat can to some extent recover (Table 1B). A number of studies (active n=16 and passive n=14) were not included in this meta-analysis due to the absence of control groups. This highlights the likely difficulty in securing undisturbed reference sites and the further challenges we face in identifying general baselines for restoration (*26*). Restoration is a relatively new discipline, but its importance to inform ecosystem health cannot be overstated for drylands because of the need to redress global change and mitigate drought and species loss.

Findings from this meta-analysis support the conclusion that investment in active restoration is a more reliable strategy in meeting ecological outcomes in dryland ecosystems and that something for nothing is a risky strategy to adopt. In contrast, recent meta-analyses in tropical and temperate forests concluded that passive recovery through natural succession was the most effective strategy (*27*, *28*). This difference profoundly suggests that environmental limitation and anthropogenic pressures are critical criteria to consider in weighing restoration options for an ecosystem. Rainfall, soil fertility, and productivity are severely constrained in dryland ecosystems (*10*), and the extent of land transformation and prior land use history further exacerbate these issues (*21*). This synthesis shows that croplands will need active restoration strategies to overcome the legacies of soil disturbances, nutrients, and pesticides (*29*).

Resources to restore ecosystems will always be in short supply relative to need, particularly in developing countries and in those with limited political incentives to address environmental deterioration (*5*). Active investment in interventions will certainly lead to more consistent positive outcomes for soils, vegetation, and habitats - arguably the foundations of ecosystem function. We face global challenges to biodiversity, natural resources, ecosystem services, and these supporting functions are thus under serious threat. We show here that while humans are certainly part of the problem we can also be the solution to some of the recovery of drylands.

References and Notes:

1. A. F. Clewell, J. Aronson, Motivations for the restoration of ecosystems. *Conserv. Biol.* **20**, 420–428 (2006).

2. A. Perino *et al.*, Rewilding complex ecosystems. *Science (80-. ).* **364**, eaav5570 (2019).

3. R. H. Hilderbrand, A. C. Watts, A. M. Randle, The myths of restoration ecology. *Ecol. Soc.* **10** (2005), doi:10.5751/ES-01277-100119.

4. W. V Reid *et al.*, *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis* (2005; https://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.356.aspx.pdf).

5. R. L. Chazdon *et al.*, A Policy-Driven Knowledge Agenda for Global Forest and Landscape Restoration. *Conserv. Lett.* **10**, 125–132 (2017).

6. I. Markevych *et al.*, Exploring pathways linking greenspace to health: Theoretical and methodological guidance. *Environ. Res.* **158**, 301–317 (2017).

7. J. Aronson, A. F. Clewell, J. N. Blignaut, S. J. Milton, Ecological restoration: A new frontier for nature conservation and economics. *J. Nat. Conserv.* **14**, 135–139 (2006).

8. S. Díaz *et al.*, The IPBES Conceptual Framework - connecting nature and people. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **14**, 1–16 (2015).

9. R. J. Hobbs, V. A. Cramer, Restoration Ecology: Interventionist Approaches for Restoring and Maintaining Ecosystem Function in the Face of Rapid Environmental Change. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **33**, 39–61 (2008).

10. Millennium Ecosystems Assessment (MEA), in *Ecosystems and Human well-being: Current State and Trends* (2005; https://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.291.aspx.pdf), pp. 1–40.

11. N. Ramankutty, A. T. Evan, C. Monfreda, J. A. Foley, Farming the planet: 1. Geographic distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*. **22**, 1–19 (2008).

12. C. M. Kennedy, J. R. Oakleaf, D. M. Theobald, S. Baruch-Mordo, J. Kiesecker, Managing the middle: A shift in conservation priorities based on the global human modification gradient. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 811–826 (2019).

13. E. G. Bonkoungou, Biodiversity in drylands: challenges and opportunities for conservation and sustainable use. Challenge Paper. *Glob. Drylands Initiat. UNDP Drylands Dev. Centre, Nairobi, Kenya.* (2001).

14. S. Díaz *et al.*, Assessing nature’s contributions to people. *Science (80-. ).* **359**, 270–272 (2018).

15. A. J. Castro, C. Quintas-Soriano, B. N. Egoh, Ecosystem services in dryland systems of the world. *J. Arid Environ.* **159**, 1–3 (2018).

16. R. P. White, J. Nackoney, in *World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C., USA.* (2013), pp. 1–58.

17. J. F. Reynolds *et al.*, Global Desertification: Building a Science for Dryland Development. *Science (80-. ).* **316**, 847–851 (2007).

18. R. Wilson *et al.*, Dryland Pastures: Establishment and Management in the Intermountain Region of Northern California. *Dryl. Pastures Establ. Manag. Intermt. Reg. North. Calif.* (2006), doi:10.3733/ucanr.8163.

19. R. Kelsey, A. Hart, H. Scott Butterfield, D. Vink, Groundwater sustainability in the San Joaquin Valley: Multiple benefits if agricultural lands are retired and restored strategically. *Calif. Agric.* **72**, 151–154 (2018).

20. C. J. Lortie, A. Filazzola, R. Kelsey, A. K. Hart, H. S. Butterfield, Better late than never: a synthesis of strategic land retirement and restoration in California. *Ecosphere*. **9**, e02367 (2018).

21. K. D. Holl, T. M. Aide, When and where to actively restore ecosystems? *For. Ecol. Manage.* **261**, 1558–1563 (2011).

22. J. Gurevitch, P. S. Curtis, M. H. Jones, Meta-analysis in ecology. **32**, 199–247 (2004).

23. V. Hedges, L., J. Gurevitch, P. Curtis, The Meta-Analysis of Response Ratios in Experimental Ecology. *Ecology*. **80**, 1150–1156 (1999).

24. G. Schwarzer, J. R. Carpenter, G. Rücker, *Meta- Analysis with R* (Springer, New York, 2015).

25. E. De Martonne, Regions of Interior-Basin Drainage. *Geogr. Rev.* **17**, 397–414 (1927).

26. Higgs E, What is good ecological restoration? *Conserv. Biol.* **11**, 338–348 (1997).

27. R. Crouzeilles *et al.*, Ecological restoration success is higher for natural regeneration than for active restoration in tropical forests. *Sci. Adv.* **3**, e1701345 (2017).

28. P. Meli *et al.*, A global review of past land use, climate, and active vs. passive restoration effects on forest recovery. *PLoS One*. **12**, 1–17 (2017).

29. D. Kleijn *et al.*, Ecological Intensification: Bridging the Gap between Science and Practice. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**, 154–166 (2019).

30. D. Moher *et al.*, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement (Chinese edition). *J. Chinese Integr. Med.* **7**, 889–896 (2009).

31. Rohatgi A., WebPlotDigitizer. Retrieved from https://automeris.io/ WebPlotDigitizer (2018).

32. M. J. Lajeunesse, Bias and correction for the log response ratio in ecological meta-analysis. *Ecology*. **96**, 2056–2063 (2015).

33. R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Found. Stat. Comput. Vienna, Austria. URL https//www.R-project.org/.* (2018).

**Acknowledgments:** This section should start by acknowledging non-author contributions and then should provide information under the following headings:

The authors declare no competing interests. This research was funded by The Nature Conservancy and York University. H.S.B. and C.J.L. formulated the ideas, M.F.M. and H.S.B. compiled data, C.J.L. and M.F.M. analyzed data, M.F.M., H.S.B., and C.J.L. wrote the manuscript, H.S.B. and C.J.L. acquired the financial support for the project. CJL was also supported as Senior Research Fellow at NCEAS and by an NSERC DG Grant in Canada.

**Data and materials availability:** Include a note explaining any restrictions on materials, such as materials transfer agreements. Note accession numbers to any data relating to the paper and deposited in a public database; include a brief description of the data set or model with the number. If all data are in the paper and supplementary materials include the sentence “All data is available in the main text or the supplementary materials.” All data, code, and materials used in the analysis must be available in some form to any researcher for purposes of reproducing or extending the analysis.

Supplementary Materials:

**Materials and Methods**

Literature search and eligible criteria

PRISMA guidelines were used to structure this synthesis and meta-analysis (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses; Fig. S2) (*30*). We systematically searched Scopus and The Web of Science using the following term combinations: [restoration\* desert\* vegetation\*] OR [restoration\* grassland\* desert\*] OR [restoration desert\* plant\*] OR [restoration "agricultural lands"] OR ["restoration techniques" desert\*] OR ["passive restoration" desert\* plant\*] OR ["active restoration" desert\* plant\*] OR [revegetation abandoned desert\*] OR [restoration "agricult\*land\*" desert\* plant\*] OR [restoration dryland\* vegetation] OR [restoration semiarid\* plant\*] OR [restoration arid\* plant\*]. The searches were done in September 2018 and returned 1504 published articles. We collected data from studies that met the following inclusion criteria: (1) research articles including results, review articles were not included; (2) agriculture as the main disturbance reported (crop and grazing lands); (3) studies with experimental (restoration practice) and control groups specifically compared; (3) reported statistical analysis and significance of treatments. After the application of the above inclusion criteria, a total of 40 studies were included in the meta-analysis (Fig. S2). GREAT!!

Data extraction

The specific restoration practice described in each study was recorded and subsequently classified as active or passive restoration. Passive restoration refers to the natural regeneration of degraded ecosystems with minimal to no human interventions such as the cessation of disturbance by installing fences to terminate grazing locally (*9*). Active restoration strategies were always direct human interventions on ecosystems to assist and accelerate their restoration (*21*). Different practices that addressed a similar restoration goal were further classified into four main categories: soil, i.e. including those practices with intervention in soils; vegetation; water supply and grazing exclusion. Soil and vegetation practices included both active and passive types of restoration, water supply was classified as an active restoration practice, and grazing exclusion as passive (Table 1A). bit clunky revise Moreover, for each study we extracted data of the restoration outcome adopted to estimate the mean effect and relative variation for each restoration practice reported in primary studies (*24*). We grouped the different outcomes into four general categories including soil, vegetation, animals, and habitat. These four categories were measured by studies with an active restoration approach while evaluation of restoration outcomes on animals such as ? was not done in passive restoration studies (Table 1B).

We collected data of all the response variables reported in each article. For each response variable, we extracted the mean and standard deviation for the treatment and control conditions or for ??? in the passive studies. When these data were provided in figures within a publication, we used WebPlotDigitizer (*31*) to extract values. In addition, we collected data of the mean annual temperature and annual precipitation from the study sites of each article to calculate the aridity index, (*25*) and recorded the reported duration of study in months. When climatic data were not provided in studies, we used the latitude and longitude listed to look up the long-term 20 year?? means from WordClim (www.worldclim.org). The aridity index and duration of studies were used as covariates in statistical models.

Statistical analysis

To determine the effect of the restoration practice over the control group, we calculated the log response ratio (lrr)(*23*). This effect size quantifies the log-proportional change between the means of the two groups compared (*32*). A negative value of the log response ratio implies the effect of the control group was higher than that of the treatment while a positive value indicates that a treatment leads to an increase in some responses evaluated. For each effect size, we calculated the lower and upper 95% confidence intervals (CI) using resampling?. When the CIs did not overlap zero, we considered the effect size to be statistically significant - I did t-tests though - state that instead please. All analyses done in R version 3.5.5 (*33*), and both the packages meta (citation) and metafor (citation) were used for meta-analytical analyses. All support code is published (Cite this Lortie, C.J. and F. Miguel. 2019. A set of R code to test dryland restoration efficacy using meta-analysis. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.2653943).

**Table 1.** The effect of active and passive restoration practices on dryland ecosystems globally. The log response ratio (effect size) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were from random effects models (cite R code here). Effect of restoration practices and outcomes were considered significant if their estimated 95% confidence intervals did not overlap 0 and were tested by t-tests with mu = 0. (A) Results of random effects models comparing categories of restoration (active versus passive) and different practices for active (water supply, soil and vegetation) and passive (soil, vegetation and grazing exclusion) restoration. (B) Results of random effects models for different outcomes for active (vegetation, soil, habitat and animals) and passive (soil, vegetation and habitat) restoration.CONFUSING - Scott - try rewording to make it more readable The outcomes listed describe target goals from each restoration intervention or practice.


|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Restoration** | **log response ratio** | **95% CI** |
| *(A)* | | |
| **Active restoration practices** | 0.22 | 0.21, 0.23 |
| Water supply | 0.64 | 0.55, 0.73 |
| Soil | 0.31 | 0.30, 0.33 |
| Vegetation | 0.18 | 0.17, 0.20 |
| **Passive restoration practices** | -0.34 | -0.37, -0.31 |
| Soil | -0.76 | -0.82, -0.70 |
| Vegetation | 0.26 | 0.21, 0.32 |
| Grazing exclusion | 0.13 | 0.03, 0.24 |
| *(B)* | | |
| **Active restoration outcomes** | | |
| Vegetation | 0.51 | 0.49, 0.52 |
| Soil | 0.22 | 0.15, 0.28 |
| Habitat | 0.06 | 0.04, 0.08 |
| Animals | -0.11 | -0.12, -0.11 |
| **Passive restoration outcomes** | | |
| Soil | -0.76 | -0.82, -0.70 |
| Vegetation | 0.44 | 0.03, 0.85 |
| Habitat | 0.16 | 0.1, 0.22 |

Figures S1-S2

Table S1


References (1-33)

**Fig. 1.** Global distribution of studies included in a meta-analysis comparing categories of restoration (active versus passive) and individual restoration practices in dryland ecosystems. Articles included in the meta-analysis reported agriculture (crop and grazing natural lands) as the main disturbance and included treatment and control groups. Light blue points represent the location of studies that used active restoration practices while dark blue shows those studies using passive recovery practices.




**Fig. 2.** Overall effect sizes (log response ratio) for the effect of active and passive restoration practices in drylands globally, based on a meta-analysis of published studies. The *x* - axis shows the natural log of the response ratio (mean and 95% confidence interval), whereas the *y* - axis describes passive (vegetation, soil and grazing exclusion) and active (water supply, vegetation and soil) restoration practices. A value of zero of the log response ratio represents there was no difference among both groups compared (treatment and control), while a positive log response ratio value indicates the mean of the treatment group was higher than that of the control group and a negative value indicates the mean of the control group was higher than that of the treatment group. Active and passive restoration practices are represented by different colors, color references are at the right of the plot. same - make it more readable please

I think you need to use geom\_text and add the sample size associated with each point please.



**Fig. S1.** Disturbances reported in drylands globally and the category of restoration implemented (active or passive). The *y*- axis represents the frequency of studies that reported each disturbance. Light blue represents the frequency of studies that implemented active restoration interventions, while dark blue represents passive restoration studies.



**Fig. S2** PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) report of a meta-analysis comparing categories of restoration (active versus passive) and individual restoration practices in dryland ecosystems globally.

**Table S1.** List of restoration practices and outcomes included in a meta-analysis comparing categories of restoration (active versus passive) and individual techniques for restoration in drylands globally. Number of entries indicates the number of independent variables and data entries obtained for each restoration technique from the studies included in the meta-analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of restoration** | **Restoration practices** | **Outcomes** | **Restoration techniques** | **No. of entries** |
| Active | soil | habitat | carbon addition, top soil removal, seeding | 45 |
| habitat | carbon amendment | 27 |
| soil | fertilization, biostimulants, seeding | 48 |
| vegetation | mycorrhizal inoculation | 128 |
| vegetation | habitat | burning, mowing | 24 |
| vegetation | mechanical disturbance, seeding | 4 |
| habitat | mowing | 3 |
| habitat | planting | 369 |
| vegetation | planting | 26 |
| soil | planting | 84 |
| animals | planting | 24 |
| vegetation | seeding | 44 |
| soil | seeding | 117 |
| vegetation | seeding and ripping | 12 |
| habitat | seeding, cutting, grazing treatments | 2 |
| habitat | seeding, gypsum and organic mulch | 9 |
| vegetation | seeding, irrigation | 7 |
| habitat | seeding, mowing and herbicide, mulching | 18 |
| vegetation | seeding, mulching, weeding | 6 |
| habitat | seeding, planting | 15 |
| vegetation | seeding, safe sites for seeds, fencing | 8 |
| vegetation | seeding, soil tilling, fertilization | 7 |
| water supply | vegetation | seeding, irrigation | 63 |
| habitat | water supply | 12 |
| Passive | grazing exclusion | vegetation | fencing | 21 |
| vegetation | grazing exclusion | 8 |
| soil | soil | mycorrhizal recovery | 6 |
| soil | natural recovery | 198 |
| vegetation | habitat | facilitation | 59 |
| habitat | natural recovery | 30 |
| vegetation | natural recovery | 4 |
| habitat | fencing | 15 |
| vegetation | grazing exclusion | 17 |