Accepted Manuscript

Title: Interspecific competition of early successional plant species in ex-arable fields as influenced by plant-soil feedback

Author: Jingying Jing T. Martijn Bezemer Wim H. van der Putten

PII: S1439-1791(15)00002-X
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.baae.2015.01.001>
Reference: BAAE 50851

To appear in:

Received date: 4-3-2014
Revised date: 4-1-2015
Accepted date: 6-1-2015

Please cite this article as: Jing, J., Bezemer, T. M., and van der Putten, W. H., Interspecific competition of early successional plant species in ex-arable fields as influenced by plant-soil feedback, *Basic and Applied Ecology* (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2015.01.001>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Interspecific competition of early successional plant species in ex-arable
fields as influenced by plant-soil feedback**

Jingying Jing^{a,b*}, T. Martijn Bezemer^b, and Wim H. van der Putten^{b,c}

^a Department of Plant Nutrition, China Agricultural University, Beijing 100193, P. R. China;

^b Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), PO
Box 50, 6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands;

^c Laboratory of Nematology, Wageningen University and Research Centre, PO Box 8123,
6700 ES Wageningen, The Netherlands

*Correspondence author. Tel.: +31 0 317 473580; fax: +31 0 317 473675.

Email address: J.Jing@nioo.knaw.nl or Jingyingjing@gmail.com.

Present address: Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-
KNAW), PO Box 50, 6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands.

13

14 **Abstract**

15 Plant-soil feedback can affect plants that belong to the same (intraspecific feedback) or
 16 different species (interspecific feedback). However, little is known about how intra- and
 17 interspecific plant-soil feedbacks influence interspecific plant competition. Here, we used
 18 plants and soil from early-stage ex-arable fields to examine how intra- and interspecific plant-
 19 soil feedbacks affect the performance of ten conditioning species and the focal species,
 20 *Jacobaea vulgaris*. Plants were grown alone and in competition in both conditioned and
 21 control soils. Overall, plant-soil feedback of the ten plant species influenced the
 22 competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* more strongly than their own competitiveness. However,
 23 effects depended on species combination: competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* was significantly
 24 enhanced by interspecific plant-soil feedback from *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Agrostis*
 25 *capillaris*, and *Trifolium dubium*, and significantly decreased by interspecific feedback from
 26 *Achillea millefolium*. Intraspecific feedback from *Taraxacum officinale* and *A. odoratum*
 27 decreased their competitiveness with *J. vulgaris*. There was a positive relationship between
 28 the strength of interspecific feedback and competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil.
 29 Multiple linear regression showed that the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil
 30 was determined by interspecific feedback and competitiveness of neighbour plants. The
 31 positive relationship between interspecific feedback and competitiveness in control soil
 32 suggests that the soil feedback effect of the competing species on *J. vulgaris* can build up
 33 quickly during competition. We conclude that the effect of plant-soil feedback on interspecific
 34 competition may be due to either legacy effects of plant species previously colonizing the soil,
 35 or immediate interspecific feedback of the competing plant species via the soil. Therefore, our
 36 results suggest that plant-soil feedback can influence interspecific plant competition through a
 37 multitude of intra- and interspecific plant-soil interactions both from predecessors, and from

38 the currently competing plant species.

Accepted Manuscript

39 **Keywords:** *Jacobaea vulgaris*, interspecific plant-soil feedback, intraspecific plant-soil
40 feedback, plant-soil interactions

Accepted Manuscript

41

42 **Introduction**

43 Plants can alter the physical, chemical and biological properties of their soil environment,
44 which, in turn, can affect plants that grow later in the soil. These interactions between plants
45 and soil properties are termed plant-soil feedback (Ehrenfeld, Ravit, & Elgersma 2005). The
46 majority of plant-soil feedback studies, mostly done in grasslands and tropical forests, report
47 negative feedbacks of plant species to their conspecifics (Kulmatiski et al. 2008; Petermann et
48 al. 2008; Mangan et al. 2010). Negative feedbacks are known to reduce competitiveness and
49 contribute to plant species replacement (Van der Putten & Peters 1997), leading to a decrease
50 in the abundance and performance over time of many early successional plant species, such as
51 *Jacobaea vulgaris* (Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2012). Thus, plant-soil
52 feedbacks can play an important role in shaping the composition of plant communities by
53 determining plant growth, abundance, and succession (Van der Putten, Van Dijk, & Peters
54 1993; Packer & Clay 2000; Kardol, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2006; Manning et al. 2008;
55 Mangan et al. 2010; Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2011; Reinhart 2012).

56 A number of studies have compared intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback using
57 pairwise feedback design (e.g. Vogelsang & Bever 2009; Kulmatiski & Beard 2011; Shannon,
58 Flory, & Reynolds 2012). Intraspecific feedback focuses on the soil-mediated effects of one
59 plant on the growth of another plant that belongs to the same species. Interspecific feedback
60 focuses on the soil-mediated effect of one plant species on another species (Van der Putten et
61 al. 2013). A recent study on the early successional plant *J. vulgaris*, for example, showed that
62 both intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback can greatly affect its biomass production (Van
63 de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2011). However, it is still largely unknown how

64 interspecific plant-soil feedbacks, both negative and positive, may affect interspecific plant-
65 plant interactions.

66 When two plants compete, the performance of both individuals can be changed through
67 competition for nutrients, light or space, but also through plant-soil feedback effects.
68 Interestingly, several studies have shown that competition between two plant species
69 (interspecific competition) can be enhanced or eliminated by plant-soil feedback effects (e.g.
70 Van der Putten & Peters 1997; Casper & Castelli 2007; Kardol et al. 2007). When two species
71 compete in soil conditioned by one species, the plant-soil feedback effect of that one plant
72 species can affect the outcome of competition via influencing the performance of itself
73 (intraspecific feedback effect), or the competing species (interspecific feedback effect).
74 However, the relative role of intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback in plant competition
75 is not well understood.

76 The aim of the present study was to investigate how plant-soil feedback can influence the
77 competitiveness of both plants that conditioned the soil and the competing species. We used
78 ten plant species from an early stage of ex-arable field succession (Kardol, Bezemer, & Van
79 der Putten 2006). First we grew the ten plant species to condition soils. Then, we examined
80 the importance of intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback for competitiveness with the
81 early successional plant species *J. vulgaris*. We tested the hypothesis that the competitive
82 ability is affected more by intraspecific than by interspecific plant-soil feedback. Therefore,
83 we expected that when two species compete in conditioned soil the performance of the
84 species that conditioned the soil will be influenced most strongly by plant-soil feedback.
85 Specifically, we expected that when the conditioning plant species exhibits negative
86 intraspecific plant-soil feedback this will reduce its competitiveness when interacting with
87 another plant species. Alternatively, we expected that positive intraspecific feedback will
88 enhance competitiveness and that both responses may depend on the sign and strength of the

89 interspecific feedback.

Accepted Manuscript

90

91 **Materials and methods**

92 To examine how plant-soil feedback of ten early secondary succession plant species
93 influences competition with the early successional species *Jacobaea vulgaris*, we conducted a
94 greenhouse experiment that consisted of two phases.

95

96 Phase 1: Soil conditioning

97 We used ten grassland species that all co-occur with *J. vulgaris* in restoration grasslands on
98 former arable fields in the Netherlands (four forbs: *Achillea millefolium*, *Myosotis arvensis*,
99 *Taraxacum officinale*, *Tripleurospermum maritimum*, four legumes: *Vicia cracca*, *Vicia*
100 *sativa* subsp. *nigra*, *Trifolium dubium*, *Trifolium repens*, and two grasses: *Agrostis capillaris*,
101 *Anthoxanthum odoratum*). In March 2012, soil was collected from a depth of 5 - 20 cm below
102 soil surface in an ex-arable field (Mossel, Ede, The Netherlands) located on sandy loam in the
103 central part of the Netherlands that was abandoned in 1995. The field soil was sieved using
104 0.5 cm mesh size to remove coarse fragments and homogenized. The soil was then separated
105 in four parts that served as replicates. Half of the soil of each replicate was sterilized by γ -
106 irradiation (minimally 25 KGray). A total of 120 pots (10 species * 3 plant treatments (as
107 described under the heading Phase 2: feedback phase)* 4 replicates) of 1 L each were then
108 filled with 1000 g of soil. We used a mixture of 500 g field soil and 500 g sterilized soil in
109 order to standardize the background soil and ensure that there were enough nutrients (released
110 through sterilization) for plant growth. The remaining sterilized soil was stored at room
111 temperature in sealed bags to be used for Phase 2.

Seeds were obtained from specialized suppliers that provide seeds collected from wild plants (Cruydt-hoech, Assen, The Netherlands; B&T World seeds, Pagnignan, France). All seeds were surface-sterilized (1 min in 2 % sodium hypochlorite solution), rinsed and sown on glass beads. The glass beads were moistened with deionized water and placed in a germination cabinet (16/8 light/dark photo regime at 22/18 °C). One week after germination, seedlings were placed at 4 °C until transplanting to pots. Seedlings were transplanted in monocultures with five seedlings in each pot. The pots were placed randomly in the greenhouse. All pots were watered every second day and the initial soil moisture level was reset to 17% (w:w) once a week by weighing. Dead seedlings were replaced during the first week of the experiment. Seedlings that emerged from the seed bank of the soil were removed manually. After eight weeks, the aboveground biomass was harvested by cutting the shoots at the soil surface. The main roots, and rhizomes were removed and the soil in each pot was then homogenized.

Phase 2: Feedback

The conditioned soil from each pot was mixed (1:1 ratio) with the stored sterilized bulk soil, in order to have ample volume of soil for plant growth and available nutrients coming from the sterilized soil. Soil from each pot was split in two halves. One half was used to test specific plant-soil feedback effects, whereas the other half was used to create control soil. To avoid pseudoreplication, we did not mix soil from the individual replicate pots. The control soil consisted of a mixture of soils conditioned by each of the ten plant species and was mixed while keeping the four replicates separate. Therefore, each control soil had 5% of own soil (1:1 dilution of 10%), but previous work has shown that such low inoculation dosage may have little and non-significant effect on a plant species (Van der Putten et al. 1988). The

advantage of the current approach is that all comparisons with the control treatment are based on identical soils. Plant-soil feedback was tested using three plant treatments: 1) one seedling per pot of each of the ten species; 2) one *J. vulgaris* seedling grown with one seedling of the ten competitors per pot (interspecific competition); 3) one *J. vulgaris* seedling per pot; all in control and conditioned soil.

There were 240 pots in total: 10 plant species $\times$ 3 plant treatments $\times$ 2 soil conditioning types $\times$ 4 replicates. For treatment 3 (one *J. vulgaris* seedling per pot), there were 40 pots filled with the control soil that was conditioned keeping four replicates separately (10 pots for each replicate). We allocated one pot of each of the four replicates to each of the ten species-specific soils (i.e. 4 unique control pots for each species-specific soil). Climatic conditions in the greenhouse were as described for the conditioning phase. Eight weeks after transplanting, all plants were harvested. Aboveground plant material was oven-dried (70 °C) for 3 days and weighed.

Data and statistical analysis

Plant-soil feedback was calculated according to Brinkman et al. (2010) as

$$\text{Feedback} = \ln(\text{Biomass}_{\text{conditioned}} / \text{Biomass}_{\text{control}})$$

$\text{Biomass}_{\text{conditioned}}$ represents the biomass of an individual plant when grown alone in conditioned soil, and $\text{Biomass}_{\text{control}}$ represents the average biomass of plants grown alone in control soil.

In order to test whether plant-soil feedback affects interspecific competition intensity, competitiveness was calculated using a log-response ratio (Hedges, Gurevitch, & Curtis 1999; Weigelt & Jolliffe 2003), so that:

159 Competitiveness = $\ln(\text{Biomass}_{\text{competition}} / \text{Biomass}_{\text{alone}})$

160 $\text{Biomass}_{\text{competition}}$ represents the biomass of an individual plant grown in a pot with
 161 interspecific competition, either grown in conditioned or in control soil, and $\text{Biomass}_{\text{alone}}$
 162 represents the average biomass of an individual plant when grown alone in control soil.

163 All data were analyzed using SPSS 19 (IBM, Chicago, Illinois, USA). Data were checked
 164 for homogeneity of variance using Levene's test and for normality by inspection of the
 165 normal-probability plot. To test the intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback effect for
 166 plants that were grown without competition, data were analyzed using nested ANOVA with
 167 the factor type of plant-soil feedback (intraspecific or interspecific) nested in the factor of soil
 168 (conditioning by ten species). For each individual species, we used a one-sample T-test to
 169 analyze whether the plant-soil feedback effect differed from zero.

170 To examine whether the effects of soil conditioning on competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* and
 171 on competitiveness of the ten species differed in conditioned and control soil, data were
 172 analyzed using nested ANOVA with the factor soil (conditioned or control) and the factor
 173 competitor (*J. vulgaris* or other species) nested into the factor plant pair (ten combinations of
 174 *J. vulgaris* with one of the ten neighbours). Independent sample T-tests were used to compare
 175 for each species the difference in competitiveness between conditioned and control soil. To
 176 determine whether there was a relationship between competitiveness or biomass of *J. vulgaris*
 177 and competitiveness or biomass of the competing species, and how this was affected by soil
 178 conditioning, we used analysis of covariance using averages for each species combination.
 179 The relationship between plant-soil feedback and competitiveness was analyzed using linear
 180 regression and means for each species/soil. Multiple regression analysis was used to
 181 determine the relative importance of (i) interspecific plant-soil feedback of *J. vulgaris* and (ii)
 182 competitiveness of the ten species against *J. vulgaris*.

183

184 **Results**

185 Overall, the intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback effects differed significantly (nested
 186 ANOVA, $F_{10,58} = 7.34$, $P = 0.041$). Soil conditioning by the ten plant species caused significant
 187 and species-specific differences in interspecific plant-soil feedback on *J. vulgaris* ($F_{9,30} = 7.34$,
 188 $P < 0.001$). *Vicia cracca* caused significantly positive feedback on *J. vulgaris*, whereas the
 189 feedback effects on *J. vulgaris* of *M. arvensis*, *A. odoratum*, *A. capillaris*, and *A. millefolium*
 190 were significantly negative (Fig. 1A). The intraspecific plant-soil feedback effects did not
 191 differ among the ten species ($F_{9,30} = 0.91$, $P = 0.53$). *Achillea millefolium* had a strong direct
 192 negative feedback that differed significantly from zero (Fig. 1B). The intraspecific plant-soil
 193 feedback effects of the other nine species were not significantly different from zero (Fig. 1B).

194 The competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* and the ten species differed significantly ($F_{10,111} = 20.10$,
 195 $P < 0.001$, Fig. 2A versus 2B), and depended greatly on the species *J. vulgaris* was competing
 196 with (plant pair: $F_{9,111} = 4.13$, $P < 0.01$). Soil conditioning influenced both magnitude and
 197 direction of the effects (soil * competitor: $F_{10,111} = 5.58$, $P < 0.001$). Soil conditioning by *T.*
 198 *dubium*, *A. odoratum*, and *A. capillaris* enhanced competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* relative to
 199 competitiveness in control soil (Fig. 2A). In contrast, soil conditioning by *A. millefolium*
 200 decreased competitiveness of *J. vulgaris*. The competitiveness of *T. officinale* and *A.*
 201 *odoratum* was decreased by soil conditioning compared with control soil (Fig. 2B). The effect
 202 of soil conditioning on competitiveness was less strong for the ten species that conditioned the
 203 soil than for *J. vulgaris* (Fig. 2B versus Fig. 2A), as indicated by the stronger absolute effect
 204 (independent of the sign of the effect) of soil conditioning on competitiveness of *J. vulgaris*
 205 compared with the other species (Fig. 2C).

There was a significantly ($F_{1,16} = 8.51$; $P = 0.01$) negative relationship between the competitiveness of the ten species and the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris*, and this relationship was not influenced by soil conditioning ($F_{1,16} = 10.21$, $P = 0.65$; Fig. 3A). Interestingly, this relationship could not be explained by negative effects of plant size on competition, as there was no evidence for a negative relationship between the biomasses of two competing species ($F_{1,16} = 2.62$, $P = 0.13$; Fig. 3B). Furthermore, there was a positive relationship between the interspecific plant-soil feedback effect on *J. vulgaris* and its competitiveness in conditioned soil ($F_{1,8} = 6.40$, $P = 0.035$, Fig. 4A), as well as in control soil ($F_{1,8} = 9.00$, $P = 0.017$, Fig. 4B). Multiple linear regression showed that the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* was related to both interspecific plant-soil feedback effect and the competitiveness of the ten species (Table 1). In contrast, there was no significant relationship between intraspecific plant-soil feedback effects of the ten species and their competitiveness in both conditioned ($F_{1,8} = 1.16$, $P = 0.31$, Fig. 4C) and control soil ($F_{1,8} = 0.33$, $P = 0.58$, Fig. 4D). Therefore, in the present study interspecific plant-soil feedback effects appeared to be more important to the outcomes of competition than intraspecific feedback effects of the conditioning species.

Discussion

In the present study, we examined how intraspecific and interspecific plant-soil feedback influenced interspecific competition between an early successional plant species and each of ten co-occurring species. We found that plant-soil feedback of these ten species had a stronger effect on the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* than on the competitiveness of the ten species themselves. Moreover, there was a positive relationship between interspecific plant-soil feedback and interspecific competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* indicating that species with which *J. vulgaris* competes well also promote the growth of *J. vulgaris* through soil feedback. Importantly, we found the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil to be determined by both interspecific plant-soil feedback and competitiveness of its neighbour. However, no relationship was observed between intraspecific plant-soil feedback of the ten species and their competitiveness, so that our main hypothesis, representing the view that intraspecific plant-soil feedback reduces plant competitiveness, was not supported.

Jacobaea vulgaris is an early successional plant species, and in the ex-arable fields its abundance peaks relatively soon after establishment followed by a rapid decline (Bezemer et al. 2006; Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2012). Recently, it has been proposed that the population dynamics of this early successional species may be affected by both intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback (Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2011). Here, we observed positive and negative feedback effects of the ten co-occurring species on *J. vulgaris*, whereas intraspecific plant-soil feedback effects of these ten species were neutral or negative (Fig. 1B). A number of studies have demonstrated that intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback can have different effects on plant performance (e.g. Van der Putten, Van Dijk, & Peters 1993; Bever 1994; Bever, Westover, & Antonovics 1997; Bever 2003; Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2011). These differences may be due to variation in sensitivity among plant species for soil-borne pathogens (Van der Putten, Van Dijk, & Peters

1993), arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (Klironomos 2003), or decomposer organisms (Miki et al. 2010).

Plant-plant interactions are widely acknowledged as a principal factor that can determine the relative dominance of species within plant communities (Brooker 2006). Previous studies have shown that effects of plant-soil feedback can be enhanced or eliminated by plant-plant interactions (e.g. Casper & Castelli 2007; Petermann et al. 2008; Hol et al. 2013; Pendergast, Burke & Carson 2013). Moreover, the response of a plant to intraspecific plant-soil feedback in the absence of competition often does not predict well how plant-soil feedback will affect the performance of that plant species in competition (Casper & Castelli 2007; Shannon, Flory, & Reynolds 2012), indicating that the effects of plant-soil feedback and plant-plant interactions are not independent. Our study shows that plant-soil feedback is important in determining the outcome of interspecific competition, but the effects of intra- and interspecific feedback differ depending on which plant species interact. This was due to sensitivity of *J. vulgaris* to interspecific plant-soil feedback, which varied from negative to positive depending on the plant species that conditioned the soil. However, competitiveness of the other ten species was not affected by intraspecific plant-soil feedback. This is probably because the intraspecific plant-soil feedback effects on the ten plant species were not significantly different from zero, and thus less likely to influence competitiveness of these plant species. It is important to note that the competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil was also determined by the competitiveness of the other plant species. Taken together, intraspecific competition from neighbour species and their plant-soil effects both can influence the performance of *J. vulgaris*.

Intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback can influence plant competition through either one of the two competing species, leading to effects ranging from competition to facilitation (Van der Putten 2009). Positive intraspecific plant-soil feedback locally will lead to decreased

diversity (Bever, Westover, & Antonovics 1997), and is likely to contribute to local competitive exclusion (Bever 2003). According to a previous study (Van de Voorde, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2011), *J. vulgaris* has strong negative intraspecific plant-soil feedback, which may reduce the performance of this early successional plant species. However, the positive relationship between interspecific plant-soil feedback and competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in our study suggests that positive interspecific plant-soil feedback may be important in slowing down competitive exclusion, which probably promotes species coexistence in plant communities.

Thus far, attention has focused on how negative plant-soil feedback may decrease species abundance (Klironomos 2002; Mangan et al. 2010; but see Reinhart 2012), or drive succession (Van der Putten, Van Dijk, & Peters 1993; Kardol, Bezemer, & Van der Putten 2006). Interestingly, our study shows that negative plant-soil feedback does not necessarily lead to reduced competition. For example, the negative intraspecific plant-soil feedback of *A. millefolium* did not affect its competitiveness with *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil. We observed a negative relationship between the competitiveness of the ten species and *J. vulgaris*. Hence, the competitiveness of the ten conditioning species was probably affected by that of *J. vulgaris*, which is influenced by interspecific plant-soil feedback at the same time. Therefore, investigating intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback effects shows that there are more possible outcomes of plant competition than predicted by intraspecific plant-soil feedbacks or net plant-soil feedback effect based on pairwise designed experiments. Thus, rates and directions of plant community development can only be understood when considering both intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedbacks (Kardol et al. 2013).

We did not find a significant relationship between biomass of the ten species and biomass of *J. vulgaris* in control and conditioned soil, which indicates that the outcome of competition was not determined by plant size. The positive relationship between interspecific plant-soil

feedback and competitiveness in control soil of *J. vulgaris* (Fig. 4B) may reveal a rapid build-up of plant-soil feedback when two competing species were growing together. This caused an effect similar to interspecific plant-soil feedback of one species to another.

Awareness of the different consequences of intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback may help to further understand plant population dynamics, community development, and species turnover through time (Fukami & Nakajima 2013). Although some studies have shown that plant-soil feedback changes with competitive context (Casper & Castelli 2007; Shannon, Flory, & Reynolds 2012), the linkage between plant-plant interaction and strength and direction of feedbacks has been largely overlooked. We conclude that during early secondary succession interactions between one focal plant species and its co-occurring species can be driven by positive or negative intra- and interspecific plant-soil feedback. The resulting process may vary from competition to facilitation. Interspecific plant-plant interactions mediated by plant-soil feedback, as well as intraspecific interactions, therefore, may contribute profoundly to the species composition and to the direction of change therein during early secondary succession.

311

312 **Acknowledgements**

313 J.J. is grateful for the encouragement and support of Prof. Fusuo Zhang. We thank Ciska

314 Raaijmakers, Gregor Disveld, Wenfeng Cong, and Minggang Wang for technical assistance.

315 J.J. was funded by National Natural Science Foundation of China (31121062, 31210103906).

316 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. This is publication XXX of the

317 Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW).

318

319 **References**

- 320 Bever, J.D., Westover, K.M., & Antonovics, J. (1997) Incorporating the soil community into
 321 plant population dynamics: the utility of the feedback approach. *Journal of Ecology*, 85, 561-
 322 573.
- 323 Bever, J.D. (2003) Soil community feedback and the coexistence of competitors: conceptual
 324 frameworks and empirical tests. *New Phytologist*, 157, 465-473.
- 325 Bezemer, T.M., Harvey, J.A., Kowalchuk, G.A., Korpershoek, H., & Van der Putten, W.H.
 326 (2006) Interplay between *Senecio jacobaea* and plant, soil, and aboveground insect
 327 community composition. *Ecology*, 87, 2002-2013.
- 328 Brinkman, E.P., Van der Putten, W.H., Bakker, E.-J., & Verhoeven, K.J.F. (2010) Plant-soil
 329 feedback: experimental approaches, statistical analyses and ecological interpretations. *Journal*
 330 *of Ecology*, 98, 1063-1073.
- 331 Brooker, R.W. (2006) Plant-plant interactions and environmental change. *New Phytologist*,
 332 171, 271-284.
- 333 Casper, B.B., & Castelli, J.P. (2007) Evaluating plant-soil feedback together with competition
 334 in a serpentine grassland. *Ecology Letters*, 10, 394-400.
- 335 Ehrenfeld, J.G., Ravit, B., & Elgersma, K. (2005) Feedback in the plant-soil system. *Annual*
 336 *Review of Environment and Resources*, 30, 75-115.
- 337 Engelkes, T., Morrien, E., Verhoeven, K.J.F., Bezemer, T.M., Biere, A., Harvey, J.A.,
 338 McIntyre, L.M., Tamis, W.L.M., & Van der Putten, W.H. (2008) Successful range-expanding
 339 plants experience less above-ground and below-ground enemy impact. *Nature*, 456, 946-948.
- 340 Fukami, T., & Nakajima, M. (2013) Complex plant-soil interactions enhance plant species
 341 diversity by delaying community convergence. *Journal of Ecology*, 101, 316-324.

- 342 Hedges, L.V., Gurevitch, J., & Curtis, P.S. (1999) The meta-analysis of response ratios in
343 experimental ecology. *Ecology*, 80, 1150-1156.
- 344 Hol, W.H.G., de Boer, W., ten Hooven, F., & van der Putten, W.H. (2013) Competition
345 increases sensitivity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) to biotic plant-soil feedback. *Plos One*, 8.
- 346 Kardol, P., Bezemer, T.M., & Van der Putten, W.H. (2006) Temporal variation in plant-soil
347 feedback controls succession. *Ecology Letters*, 9, 1080-1088.
- 348 Kardol, P., Cornips, N.J., Van Kempen, M.M.L., Bakx-Schotman, J.M.T., & Van der Putten,
349 W.H. (2007) Microbe-mediated plant-soil feedback causes historical contingency effects in
350 plant community assembly. *Ecological Monographs*, 77, 147-162.
- 351 Kardol, P., De Deyn, G.B., Laliberte, E., Mariotte, P., & Hawkes, C.V. (2013) Biotic plant-
352 soil feedbacks across temporal scales. *Journal of Ecology*, 101, 309-315.
- 353 Klironomos, J.N. (2003) Variation in plant response to native and exotic arbuscular
354 mycorrhizal fungi. *Ecology*, 84, 2292-2301.
- 355 Kulmatiski, A., Beard, K.H., Stevens, J.R., & Cobbold, S.M. (2008) Plant-soil feedbacks: a
356 meta-analytical review. *Ecology Letters*, 11, 980-992.
- 357 Kulmatiski, A., & Beard, K.H. (2011) Long-term plant growth legacies overwhelm short-term
358 plant growth effects on soil microbial community structure. *Soil Biology Biochemistry*, 43,
359 823-830.
- 360 Mangan, S.A., Schnitzer, S.A., Herre, E.A., Mack, K.M.L., Valencia, M.C., Sanchez, E.I., &
361 Bever, J.D. (2010) Negative plant-soil feedback predicts tree-species relative abundance in a
362 tropical forest. *Nature*, 466, 752-U10.
- 363 Manning, P., Morrison, S.A., Bonkowski, M., & Bardgett, R.D. (2008) Nitrogen enrichment
364 modifies plant community structure via changes to plant-soil feedback. *Oecologia*, 157, 661–
365 673.

- 366 McCarthy-Neumann, S., & Kobe, R.K. (2010) Conspecific and heterospecific plant-soil
 367 feedbacks influence survivorship and growth of temperate tree seedlings. *Journal of Ecology*,
 368 98, 408-418.
- 369 Miki, T., Ushio, M., Fukui, S., & Kondoh, M. (2010) Functional diversity of microbial
 370 decomposers facilitates plant coexistence in a plant-microbe-soil feedback model.
 371 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the the United States of America*, 107,
 372 14251-14256.
- 373 Packer, A., & Clay, K. (2000) Soil pathogens and spatial patterns of seedling mortality in a
 374 temperate tree. *Nature*, 404, 278-281.
- 375 Pendergast, T.H., Burke, D.J., & Carson, W.P. (2013) Belowground biotic complexity drives
 376 aboveground dynamics: a test of the soil community feedback model. *New Phytologist*, 197,
 377 1300-1310.
- 378 Petermann, J.S., Fergus, A.J.F., Turnbull, L.A., & Schmid, B. (2008) Janzen-Connell effects
 379 are widespread and strong enough to maintain diversity in grasslands. *Ecology*, 89, 2399-2406.
- 380 Reinhart, K.O. (2012) The organization of plant communities: negative plant-soil feedbacks
 381 and semiarid grasslands. *Ecology*, 93, 2377-2385.
- 382 Smith, L.M., & Reynolds, H.L. (2012) Positive plant-soil feedback may drive dominance of a
 383 woodland invader, *Euonymus fortunei*. *Plant Ecology*, 213, 853-860.
- 384 Shannon, S., Flory, S.L., & Reynolds, H. (2012) Competitive context alters plant-soil
 385 feedback in an experimental woodland community. *Oecologia*, 169, 235-243.
- 386 Van de Voorde, T.F.J., Van der Putten, W.H., & Bezemer, T.M. (2011) Intra- and
 387 interspecific plant-soil interactions, soil legacies and priority effects during old-field
 388 succession. *Journal of Ecology*, 99, 945-953.

- Van de Voorde, T.F.J., Van der Putten, W.H., & Bezemer, T.M. (2012) The importance of plant-soil interactions, soil nutrients, and plant life history traits for the temporal dynamics of *Jacobaea vulgaris* in a chronosequence of old-fields. *Oikos*, 121, 1251-1262.
- Van der Putten, W.H. (2009) A multitrophic perspective on functioning and evolution of facilitation in plant communities. *Journal of Ecology*, 97, 1131-1138.
- Van der Putten, W.H., Van Dijk, C., Troelstra SR. (1988) Biotic soil factors affecting the growth and development of *Ammophila arenaria*. *Oecologia*, 76, 313-320.
- Van der Putten, W.H., Van Dijk, C., & Peters, B.A.M. (1993) Plant-specific soil-borne diseases contribute to succession foredune vegetation. *Nature*, 362, 53-56.
- Van der Putten, W.H., & Peters, B.A.M. (1997) How soil-borne pathogens may affect plant competition. *Ecology*, 78, 1785-1795.
- Van der Putten, W.H., Bardgett, R., Bever, J.D., Bezemer, T.M., Casper, B.B., Fukami, T., Kardol, P., Klironomos, J., Kulmatiski, A., Schweitzer, J.A., Suding, K.N., Van de Voorde, T.F.J., & Wardle, D.A. (2013) Plant-soil feedback: the past, the present and future challenges. *Journal of Ecology*, 101, 265-276.
- Vogelsang, K.M., & Bever, J.D. (2009) Mycorrhizal densities decline in association with nonnative plants and contribute to plant invasion. *Ecology*, 90, 399-407.
- Weigelt, A., & Jolliffe, P. (2003) Indices of plant competition. *Journal of Ecology*, 91, 707-720.

409 **Figure legends**

410 **Fig. 1.** Plant-soil feedback effect of soil conditioning by each of ten plant species on (A)
 411 *Jacobaea vulgaris* (interspecific feedback), and (B) on themselves (intraspecific feedback). *
 412 indicates significant difference from zero at $P < 0.05$. Data are mean $\pm$ SE.

413 **Fig. 2.** Competitiveness in conditioned and control soils of (A) *J. vulgaris*, and (B) ten
 414 conditioning species. Absolute difference in competitiveness between conditioned and control
 415 soil for *J. vulgaris* and the conditioning species(C: the insert in B). Asterisks
 416 indicatesignificant difference ($P < 0.05$) between conditioned and control soil in (A) and (B)
 417 and between *J. vulgaris* and the other species in (C). Data are mean $\pm$ SE.

418 **Fig. 3.** Relationship between (A) competitiveness of ten conditioning species and
 419 competitiveness of *J. vulgaris*, and (B) plant biomass of the conditioning species and biomass
 420 of *J. vulgaris* in control and conditioned soil.

421 **Fig. 4.** Relationship between plant-soil feedback on *J. vulgaris* when grown alone and
 422 competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in (A) conditioned soil ($r=0.67$, $P=0.035$) and (B) control soil
 423 ($r=0.78$, $P=0.017$), and plant-soil feedback of ten conditioning species when grown alone and
 424 competitiveness in (C) conditioned soil and (D) control soil.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Table 1. Results of a multiple linear regression analysis testing the effects of interspecific plant-soil feedback, and competitiveness of ten conditioning species on competitiveness of *J. vulgaris* in conditioned soil

Parameters	Coefficients	Standardized coefficients	Overall R^2	Overall F value
Intercept	-1.703***		0.84	18.28
Plant-soil feedback of <i>J. vulgaris</i> when grown alone	1.617**	0.63		
Competitiveness of the conditioning species	-1.389**	-0.63		

P < 0.01; *P < 0.001.

425

426

Zusammenfassung

Pflanze-Boden-Feedback kann Pflanzen beeinflussen, die zur selben Art (intraspezifisches Feedback) oder zu unterschiedlichen Arten (interspezifisches Feedback) gehören. Indessen ist wenig darüber bekannt, wie intra- und interspezifisches Pflanze-Boden-Feedback die interspezifische Konkurrenz zwischen Pflanzen beeinflussen. Wir studierten diese Feedbacks an zehn konditionierenden Arten und der Zielart *Jacobaea vulgaris* mit Pflanzen und Boden von kürzlich aufgegebenen Ackerflächen. Die Pflanzen wurden allein und in Konkurrenz und in konditioniertem und nicht konditioniertem Boden kultiviert. Insgesamt beeinflussten die Pflanze-Boden-Feedbacks der zehn Pflanzen die Konkurrenzfähigkeit von *J. vulgaris* stärker als ihre eigene Konkurrenzfähigkeit. Indessen variierten die Effekte mit der Artenkombination: Die Konkurrenzfähigkeit von *J. vulgaris* wurde signifikant durch interspezifisches Pflanze-Boden-Feedback von *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Agrostis capillaris* und *Trifolium dubium* gestärkt und signifikant durch interspezifisches Feedback von *Achillea millefolium* verringert. Intraspezifisches Feedback von *Taraxacum officinale* and *A. odoratum* reduzierte ihre Konkurrenzfähigkeit mit *J. vulgaris*. Es bestand eine positive Beziehung zwischen der Stärke des interspezifischen Feedbacks und der Konkurrenzfähigkeit von *J. vulgaris* in konditioniertem Boden. Multiple lineare Regressionsanalyse zeigte, dass die Konkurrenzfähigkeit von *J. vulgaris* in konditioniertem Boden durch interspezifisches Feedback und die Konkurrenzfähigkeit der Nachbarpflanzen bestimmt war. Die positive Beziehung zwischen interspezifischem Feedback und Konkurrenzfähigkeit in Kontroll-Boden legt nahe, dass sich der Effekt des Boden-Feedbacks der konkurrierenden Arten auf *J. vulgaris* schnell während der Konkurrenz aufbauen kann. Wir schließen, dass der Einfluss des Pflanze-Boden-Feedbacks auf die interspezifische Konkurrenz entweder auf ein langfristiges Nachwirken der Pflanzenarten, die in der Erde wuchsen, zurückzuführen sein könnte oder auf unmittelbares interspezifisches Feedback der konkurrierenden Pflanzenart über den Boden. Somit legen unsere Ergebnisse nahe, dass

Pflanze-Boden-Feedback die interspezifische Konkurrenz
zwischen Pflanzen durch eine Vielzahl von intra- und
interspezifischen Pflanze-Boden-Interaktionen beeinflussen
kann, sowohl durch Vorgänger als auch durch die aktuell
konkurrierenden Pflanzenarten.