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**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 land conversion and 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 especially those experiencing severe anthropogenic pressures and environmental stress.

**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*). Restoration of degraded ecosystems provides 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 (*14*) such 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*), and continued land conversion (e.g. to agriculture), land degradation, and climate change (*17*) all threaten delivery of ecosystem services from these systems (*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 observations measured across all studies. Among the diverse disturbances reported in drylands globally (Fig. S1), we focused on restoration within 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 after removing human disturbances (*21*, *22*). We also extracted response data outcomes for each specific restoration practice (*23*). The success of these restoration practices and outcomes was assessed using the log response ratio (lrr) (*24*). We grouped active restoration practices into the following three categories based on their primary focus: soil, vegetation, and water supplementation (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 used random effects models to account for the variability within the studies evaluated (*25*), and then applied post hoc meta-regressions to test the potential influence of aridity (*26*) and time 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 was removed and no other interventions were applied) also had positive effects on restoration outcomes (Table 1A, Fig. 2) such us vegetation and habitat (Table 1B). Nonetheless, passive recovery 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 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 (lrr aridity = -0.01, 95% CI = -0.02 to -0.01; lrr time = 0.003, 95% CI= 0.003 to 0.0035). Duration of recovery positively influenced passive strategies but variation in aridity was not generally relevant (lrr aridity= 0.004, 95% CI = -0.002 to 0.01; lrr time = 0.01, 95% CI = 0.008 to 0.01). Soils did not passively recover in drylands, but plants and habitat can to some extent recover (Table 1B). Several 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 (*27*). 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 (*28*, *29*). 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 (*30*).

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 functions. We face global challenges to biodiversity, natural resources, ecosystem services and supporting functions than 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.
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**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 (Lortie C.J. and Miguel M.F. 2019. R code, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.2653943). Effect of active and passive restoration strategies was tested by t-tests with mu = 0, and restoration practices and outcomes were considered significant if their estimated 95% confidence intervals did not overlap 0. (A) Random effects model results comparing restoration practices. (B) Random effects model results comparing restoration outcomes. The outcomes listed describe target goals from each restoration intervention or practice.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Restoration** | **log response ratio** | **95% CI** |
| *(A)* | | |
| **Active restoration practices** | 0.28 | 0.21, 0.35 |
| Water supplementation | 0.64 | 0.55, 0.73 |
| Soil | 0.31 | 0.30, 0.33 |
| Vegetation | 0.18 | 0.17, 0.20 |
| **Passive restoration practices** | -0.35 | -0.44, -0.26 |
| 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 |

**Fig. 1.** Global distribution of studies reporting different disturbances and implementing active or passive restoration strategies in dryland ecosystems (n = 178). Articles included in the meta-analysis reported agriculture (crop and grazing natural lands) as the main disturbance and included restoration practice and control groups (n = 40). Red points represent the location of studies that used active restoration practices while blue points show those studies using passive recovery practices.
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**Fig. 2.** Assessment of overall effect sizes (log response ratio) and 95% confidence intervals for active and passive restoration practices included in a meta-analysis on restoration strategies in drylands globally. The dashed vertical line denotes no effect of restoration practices, or a mean of 0. A positive log response ratio value indicates the mean of the restoration practice 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 restoration practice.
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