This is the preprint of the contribution published as:

Ju, W., Moorhead, D.L., **Shen, G.**, Cui, Y., Fang, L. (2023): Soil aggregate development and associated microbial metabolic limitations alter grassland carbon storage following livestock removal *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **177**, art. 108907

The publisher's version is available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2022.108907

1	Soil aggregate development and associated microbial metabolic
2	limitations alter grassland carbon storage following livestock removal
3	Wenliang Ju ^{a, b, c} , Daryl L. Moorhead ^d , Guoting Shen ^e , Yongxing Cui ^f , Linchuan Fang
4	a, b, g, *
5	^a School of Resources and Environmental Engineering, Wuhan University of
6	Technology, Wuhan 430070, China
7	^b Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Ministry of
8	Water Resources, Yangling 712100, China
9	° School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China
10	^d Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Toledo, 2801 W. Bancroft St,
11	Toledo, OH 43606-3390, USA
12	^e Department of Soil Ecology, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ,
13	Theodor-Lieser-Straße 4 06120 Halle (Saale), Germany
14	^f Sino-French Institute for Earth System Science, College of Urban and Environmental
15	Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
16	^g CAS Center for Excellence in Quaternary Science and Global Change, Chinese
17	Academy of Sciences, Xi'an 710061, China
18	* Corresponding author
19	Linchuan Fang (Email: flinc629@hotmail.com)
20	School of Resources and Environmental Engineering, Wuhan University of Technology,

21 122 Luoshi Road, Wuhan, Hubei, 430070, China

22 Abstract

23 Natural restoration of degraded grasslands following livestock removal changed soil nutrient and carbon concentrations, soil aggregate distributions, and patterns of 24 25 extracellular enzyme activities. Here, we used an ecoenzymatic stoichiometry model to 26 quantify microbial resource limitations in semiarid grassland soil aggregates at 0, 11, 26, and 36 years after livestock removal and linked these limitations to microbial carbon 27 28 use efficiency (CUE), which was also estimated from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}). 29 Overall, livestock removal altered the size distribution of soil aggregates, increased 30 microbial resources and stimulated extracellular enzyme activities. Longer livestock 31 removal increased the proportion of small aggregates. Microbial carbon (C) and 32 phosphorus (P) limitations in soil aggregates declined to minimum levels at 26 years 33 following livestock removal and then increased after 36 years, with an opposite trend for CUE_{ST}. Additionally, the greatest resource limitations to microorganisms were 34 35 found in smaller aggregates under long-term livestock removal. Random forest and 36 structural equation models revealed that soil abiotic factors, especially total nitrogen 37 and pH, were key determinants of microbial resource limitation in soil aggregates. 38 Moreover, microbial C and P limitations had significant direct effects on the estimated 39 microbial CUE_{ST}. Thus, increasing microbial metabolic limitations after long-term 40 livestock removal could reduce microbial C turnover, potentially reducing soil C 41 sequestration. Overall, this study revealed that livestock removal altered soil aggregate 42 development as well as the allocation of resources in aggregates and consequent 43 microbial resource limitations, ultimately providing information that may be useful for 44 developing grassland management strategies to enhance C sequestration.

45 Keywords: Ecoenzymatic stoichiometry; Livestock removal; Microbial carbon
46 turnover; Resource limitation; Semiarid grasslands; Soil aggregates

47 **1. Introduction**

48 Grassland soils in semiarid regions store large amounts of carbon that can help 49 mitigate climate change, but overgrazing by livestock has led to extensive degradation 50 (Wiesmeier et al., 2015; Sattari et al., 2016; Prommer et al., 2020). Livestock removal 51 (LR), as a "nature-based" eco-engineering measure, has been used globally to restore 52 degraded grassland ecosystems (Wang et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021a; Oliveira et al., 53 2021). This approach can improve vegetation diversity, which in turn stimulates 54 microbial growth and turnover rates and increases soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks 55 (Prommer et al., 2020). However, long-term livestock removal can reduce vegetation 56 diversity and richness (Jing et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2018) and inputs of organic matter 57 to the soil (Wilson et al., 2018). A recent study reported that the total and particulate 58 organic carbon contents of grasslands in Inner Mongolia, China, peaked 21 years after 59 livestock removal but declined over 34 years (Dong et al., 2021). These patterns are 60 consistent with the intermediate disturbance hypothesis as applied to grazing 61 disturbance in grasslands (Fensham et al., 2011; Gao and Carmel, 2020). Moreover, it 62 is likely that soil microbial metabolic limitations develop when declining inputs disrupt 63 the balance between resource supply and microbial demand (Sinsabaugh and Shah, 2012; Mooshammer et al., 2014b; Roy and Bagchi, 2021). However, it is unclear 64 65 whether and/or how the metabolism of soil microorganisms in semiarid grasslands is 66 affected by long-term livestock removal.

Restoration also alters the physical structure of soils, especially soil aggregation,
which is a key factor affecting soil microbial communities (Bach and Hofmockel, 2014;
Wilpiszeski et al., 2019). Environmental conditions such as substrate availability and
moisture in the pore spaces within soil aggregates determine the potential for
biogeochemical reactions mediated by microorganisms (Schutter and Dick, 2002;

72 Wilpiszeski et al., 2019). A recent study found that enzyme activity, microbial carbon 73 use efficiency (CUE) and respiration in soil macroaggregates are more sensitive to warming than in microaggregates (Liu et al., 2021b). Additionally, nitrogen and water 74 75 inputs can redistribute microbial activity across different-sized soil aggregates in arid 76 and semiarid grasslands, which in turn affects SOC stability and microbial nutrient 77 limitation (Wang et al., 2015). Past studies have focused on the effects of livestock 78 grazing and removal on soil aggregate size distribution, microbial diversity and activity 79 (Prieto et al., 2011; Olivera et al., 2014; Goenster-Jordan et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021a; 80 Roy and Bagchi, 2021), but to our knowledge none have linked soil microbial 81 metabolism to aggregate-scale microhabitats. Understanding the status of microbial 82 metabolism in various soil aggregates is needed to summarize microscale 83 biogeochemical reactions.

84 Microorganisms are key players in soil biogeochemical cycles, degrading organic 85 matter and regulating soil nutrient cycling and carbon (C) balance (Bahram et al., 2018). 86 These processes are partly driven by the activities of extracellular enzymes (Nannipieri 87 et al., 2002; Sinsabaugh et al., 2009), and both soil microbial metabolism and 88 extracellular enzyme activities (EEAs) are controlled by resource (e.g., C and nutrients) 89 limitations (Sinsabaugh and Shah, 2012; Camenzind et al., 2018). Over the past two 90 decades, an increasing number of global or regional studies have quantified the level of 91 soil microbial metabolic limitations using the ecoenzymatic stoichiometry theory 92 (EEST) (Sinsabaugh et al., 2009; Moorhead et al., 2016; DeForest and Moorhead, 2020; 93 Wang et al., 2020; Feyissa et al., 2022). However, whether EEST can reveal the 94 prevalence and consequences of microbial resource limitation within and between size categories of grassland soil aggregates has not been elucidated. 95

The EEST represents the theoretical intersection of ecological stoichiometry and

97 metabolism, predicting the metabolic limitations of microorganisms in soil ecosystems 98 from patterns of extracellular enzyme activities (Sinsabaugh and Shah, 2012; Cui et al., 99 2021). This assumes that the soil community derives its resource requirements from the 100 catalysis of polymeric substrates so that relative resource limitations can be quantified 101 by the relative activities of EEAs associated with C, nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) 102 acquisition (Sinsabaugh et al., 2009). The EEST also suggests that soil microbial 103 communities maintain relative stoichiometric homeostasis, and when the stoichiometry 104 of resource supply does not match the stoichiometry of microbial demand (i.e., the 105 stoichiometric imbalance theory or SIT), microbial activity will be limited by specific 106 nutrients (Sterner and Elser, 2002). The SIT suggests that microbial decomposers not 107 only regulate enzyme production and stoichiometry but can also change biomass 108 stoichiometry and element use efficiencies to maximize growth and maintain 109 community homeostasis (Mooshammer et al., 2014b; Yuan et al., 2019). Moreover, 110 microbial resource limitations are directly relevant to the fate of soil C (Camenzind et 111 al., 2018).

112 Microorganisms can either use organic C as an energy source or convert it into 113 biomass and enzymes, with carbon use efficiency (CUE) estimated as the proportion of total C uptake allocated to production (Sinsabaugh et al., 2013). Thus, CUE is a key 114 115 parameter to assess microbial contributions to soil C turnover, with higher CUE 116 possibly promoting C accumulation and stabilization in soils (Manzoni et al., 2012; 117 Gever et al., 2019). Sinsabaugh and Shah (2012) developed a stoichiometric model 118 linking EEAs, microbial biomass and environmental resources with microbial CUE_{ST} 119 that can serve as a model for microbial C turnover (Sinsabaugh et al., 2016; Gai et al., 2021; Feyissa et al., 2022; Schimel et al., 2022). Therefore, it is both possible and likely 120 121 useful to identify how changing microbial resource limitations in developing soil 122 aggregates with long-term livestock removal affect CUE and soil C balance.

123 This study collected soils from 0-36 years after livestock removal from semiarid grasslands on the Loess Plateau of China to decipher microbial metabolic limitations in 124 125 developing soil aggregates. We investigated possible microbial resource limitations in different sized aggregates using an ecoenzymatic vector model (Moorhead et al., 2016) 126 127 and microbial CUE estimated from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}) (Sinsabaugh et al., 128 2016; Schimel et al., 2022). Here, we propose three hypotheses: (i) Short-term livestock 129 removal will generally increase microbial metabolism in soil aggregates as plant C 130 inputs to soils increase with reduced grazing and soil aggregates develop in the absence 131 of trampling. (ii) Long-term livestock removal will increase microbial resource 132 limitation due to declining resource inputs and shifting allocations among different size 133 classes of developing soil aggregates. (iii) An overall negative feedback on microbial CUE will result from increasing resource limitations and subsequently reduce C 134 135 sequestration over the long term.

- 136 **2. Materials and methods**
- 137 *2.1. Study area, site design, and sampling*

138 The study area was selected in a semiarid steppe on the Loess Plateau located in the Yunwushan National Natural Grassland Protection Zone (106°21'-106°27' E, 139 36°10′-36°17′ N) in Guyuan city, Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region, China (Jing et al., 140 141 2014; Liu et al., 2021a). This natural area has been protected since 1982 to monitor the 142 long-term recovery of degraded grasslands. The area covers 6700 ha, and its elevation 143 ranges between 1800 and 2100 m. This area has a typical continental monsoon climate, 144 with an average annual precipitation of 425 mm and an average annual temperature of 7 °C. Over 60% of precipitation occurs in July-September, and the highest and lowest 145 temperatures occur in July (25 °C) and January (-14 °C), respectively. The soil is 146

147 classified as a Haplic Calcisol in the FAO/UNESCO soil classification system.

148 In early September 2018, we studied four grassland sites along a chronosequence of livestock removal times. Livestock was removed (stocking rate is 0) at three sites in 149 150 1982, 1992, and 2007 to allow natural restoration, corresponding to removal durations of 36 years (LR36), 26 years (LR26), and 11 years (LR11), respectively. Meanwhile, 151 continued moderate grazing (8 sheep $ha^{-1} y^{-1}$) at the remaining site since 1982 was 152 considered as a reference (LR0). To minimize the effect of site conditions on the 153 154 experimental results, all sites were selected with similar soil types, elevations, slopes, 155 and management histories (Table S1). Three sampling plots (20 m \times 10 m) were randomly established at each LR site (> 200 ha), and separated by > 50 m. After 156 157 removing the litter layer, five soil cores were collected from the top 10 cm of the soil 158 profile in each plot along a sigmoidal transect using sterile aluminium containers (10 159 cm high and 15 cm diameter) to preserve the original physical and biochemical 160 properties of the samples. After removing litter, roots, stones, and debris, the bulk soil 161 samples at each site were passed through an ethanol-sterilized 8 mm sieve. All sieved 162 samples were mixed into a composite sample for each plot and stored at 4 °C for further 163 analysis.

164 2.2. Soil aggregates and physiochemical analysis

Pretreated soil samples were dried in a sterile environment at 4 °C and stored for one week to achieve ~20% moisture before aggregates were isolated. This facilitated the dry-sieving process and maintained the typical moisture status of the soils in the area studied. Three aggregate size classes were isolated through a modified "dry sieving of optimal moisture-fresh soil" method (Schutter and Dick, 2002; Bach and Hofmockel, 2014) as follows: large macroaggregates (> 2 mm; lma), small macroaggregates (0.25-2 mm; sma), and microaggregates (< 0.25 mm; mia). This procedure likely minimizes the 172 disturbance of drying and wetting to the soil microbial community and extracellular 173 enzyme activity (Bach and Hofmockel, 2014). In brief, approximately 300 g of fresh 174 soil at ~20% moisture was manually separated into three aggregate sizes by dry sieving 175 on a series of 2 sterile sieves (2 mm and 0.25 mm). The resulting soil aggregates were divided into two subsamples of each size class. One subsample was stored at 4 °C for 176 177 subsequent analysis of extracellular enzyme activity and microbial biomass. The other 178 subsample was air-dried for physicochemical analysis. Soil pH was measured using a 179 pH metre (Model 225, Denver Instrument, USA) in a 1:2.5 soil:water (w/v) mixture. 180 The soil organic carbon (SOC) content was measured by the dichromate oxidation method. The total nitrogen (TN) content of the soil was measured using an automatic 181 182 Kjeldahl analyser (Kjeltec 2300, FOSS Corporation, Denmark). The total phosphorus 183 (TP) content was measured by the molybdenum blue method using an ultraviolet 184 spectrophotometer (UV3200, Shimadzu Corporation, Japan).

185 2.3. Analysis of soil EEAs and microbial biomass

186 We quantified extracellular enzyme activities (EEAs) in each size class of soil aggregates using a fluorimetric microplate enzyme assay (Marx et al., 2001; Saiya-Cork 187 188 et al., 2002), including C-acquiring enzymes (β -1,4-glucosidase (BG; EC 3.2.1.21) and β-D-cellobiosidase (CBH; EC 3.2.1.91)), N-acquiring 189 enzymes (β-1,4-N-190 acetylglucosaminidase (NAG; EC 3.1.6.1) and L-leucine aminopeptidase (LAP; 191 3.4.11.1)), and P-acquiring enzymes (alkaline phosphatase (AP; EC 3.1.3.1)). These 192 EEAs were measured fluorescently using substrate solutions labelled with highly 193 fluorescent compounds, 4-methylumbelliferone (MUB) or 7-amino-4-methylcoumarin 194 (AMC). Specifically, sample suspensions were prepared by adding 1 g of fresh soil to 125 ml of 50 mM acetate buffer. The resulting soil suspension was continuously stirred 195 196 as 200 µl aliquots were dispensed into 96-well microplates that served as the sample

197 assay, blank, and quench standard. Twelve replicates were used for sample assay wells, 198 and six replicates were used for blank and quench standard wells. In addition, 50 µl of 199 200 mM substrate solution was added to sample wells, 50 µl of acetate buffer was added 200 to blank wells, and 50 µl of standard (10 mM MUB or AMC) was added to quench 201 standard wells. Negative control wells received 200 µl of acetate buffer and 50 µl of 202 substrate solution. Reference standard wells received 200 µl of acetate buffer and 50 µl 203 of standard. There were four replicate wells for each negative control and reference 204 standard. The microplates were incubated in the dark at 25 °C for up to 4 h, and the 205 reaction was then stopped by adding 10 µl of 1.0 M NaOH to each well. Fluorescence 206 was measured using a microplate reader with 365 nm excitation and 450 nm emission 207 filters (M200Pro, Tecan Infinite, Switzerland).

208 The microbial biomass C (MBC), N (MBN), and P (MBP) contents in each size 209 class of soil aggregates were determined using the chloroform fumigation-extraction 210 method (Brookes et al., 1982; Vance et al., 1987). Briefly, 30 g of fresh soil was 211 exposed to ethanol-free CHCl₃ at 25 °C for 24 h in a dark environment. For the MBC 212 and MBN analyses, the sample was extracted using 100 ml of 0.5 M K₂SO₄ after 213 removal of the fumigant. A nonfumigated control was extracted using the same method. 214 The C and N contents of the extracts were measured using a TOC/TN analyser (Multi 215 N/C 3100, Analytik Jena, Germany). For the MBP analyses, the sample was extracted 216 using 100 ml of 0.5 M NaHCO₃ after removal of the fumigant. Unfumigated controls 217 were extracted using the same method. The P content of the extracts spiked with molybdenum-antimony reagent was measured at 710 nm using an ultraviolet 218 219 spectrophotometer. The conversion coefficients for MBC, MBN, and MBP used in this study were 0.45, 0.54, and 0.40, respectively (Joergensen and Mueller, 1996). 220

221 2.4. Calculating microbial stoichiometric imbalance, homeostasis, resource limitation,

and CUE and CUE

223 The ratio of soil resource stoichiometry to microbial resource stoichiometry was 224 used to assess the relative stoichiometric element imbalance in the resource supply and 225 demand of microbial communities (Mooshammer et al., 2014b). This imbalance (C:N, 226 C:P, or N:P) was calculated as the ratio of SOC:TN_{resource} (or SOC:TP or TN:TP) to 227 MBC:MBN_{microbes} (or MBC:MBP or MBN:MBP). Ecological stoichiometry theory 228 suggests that the C:N:P ratio in microbial biomass is tightly constrained despite wide 229 variation in C:N:P ratios in soils due to the stoichiometric homeostasis of microbial 230 communities (Sterner and Elser, 2002). Accordingly, Equation (1) was used to calculate 231 the degree of microbial element stoichiometric homeostasis. 232 $H' = \operatorname{Ln}(x)/\operatorname{Ln}(y)$ (1) 233 where x is the microbial resource stoichiometry (MBC:MBN, MBC:MBP or 234 MBN:MBP) and y is the soil resource stoichiometry (SOC:TN, SOC:TP or TN:TP). An

235 $H' \gg 1$ indicates strong stoichiometric homeostasis, whereas $H' \approx 1$ indicates no or very 236 weak stoichiometric homeostasis.

Vector analysis (vector length and vector angle) of soil EEAs was used to quantify
microbial resource limitations (Moorhead et al., 2016). Vector length (Equation (2))
represents microbial C limitation, quantifying relative C versus nutrient acquisition;
vector angle (Equation (3)) quantifies relative P versus N acquisition.

241 Vector length = $SQRT(x^2+y^2)$ (2) 242 Vector angle (°) = DEGREES(ATAN2(y, x)) (3) 242 $H_{ac}(DC)/L_{ac}(DAC+LAD)$ for the solution contribution of C

where *x* represents [Ln (BG)/Ln (NAG+LAP)] for the relative enzyme activities of C versus N acquisition and *y* represents [Ln (BG)/Ln (AP)] for the relative enzyme activities of C versus P acquisition. Vector angles > 45° suggest a relative microbial P limitation, whereas angles < 45° represent relative microbial N limitation. The strength of microbial P limitation increases with an increasing vector angle, whereas microbial
N limitation increases with a decreasing angle. Microbial C limitation increases with
vector length.

Microbial CUE derived from the model of stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}) was calculated using Equations (4)-(6) (Sinsabaugh and Shah, 2012; Sinsabaugh et al., 2016; Schimel et al., 2022). CUE_{ST} is a fundamentally different way of viewing resource use efficiency than classical CUE estimates. Rather, it assesses how microbes shift C use among polymeric sources in response to substrate stoichiometry.

255
$$CUE_{ST} = CUE_{max} \times ((S_{C:N} \times S_{C:P})/[(K_{C:N} + S_{C:N}) \times (K_{C:P} + S_{C:P})])^{0.5}$$
 (4)

256
$$S_{C:N} = B_{C:N}/L_{C:N} \times 1/EEA_{C:N}$$
 (5)

257
$$S_{C:P} = B_{C:P}/L_{C:P} \times 1/EEA_{C:P}$$
 (6)

where K_{C:N} and K_{C:P} are half-saturation constants for CUE_{ST} based on the stoichiometry 258 259 of substrate C:N and C:P availabilities. We assumed that K_{C:N} and K_{C:P} were 0.5 for the model in this study and that CUE_{max} was 0.6 (Sinsabaugh et al., 2016). B_{C:X} is the 260 261 elemental C:N or C:P ratio of microbial biomass. L_{C:X} is the elemental composition of 262 the available substrate, and EEA_{C:X} is the ratio of enzymatic activities directed towards 263 acquiring C and nutrients (X) from the environment. L_{C:N} and L_{C:P} were estimated as SOC:TN and SOC:TP, respectively. EEA_{C:N} was calculated as BG/(NAG+LAP), and 264 265 $EEA_{C:P}$ was calculated as BG/AP.

266 2.5. Statistical analyses

All the following statistical analyses were performed in R software v.4.1.3. Prior to statistical analysis, all data were first tested for normality and homogeneity of variance using the "car" package. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey's HSD test (P < 0.05) was used to determine the effects of livestock removal 271 duration and soil aggregate size on different variables (i.e., soil physicochemical 272 properties, enzyme activities, and microbial biomass and resource metabolism). Linear 273 regression was used to determine microbial stoichiometric homeostasis, the relationship 274 between vector length and vector angle, and the relationship of CUE_{ST} with microbial 275 resource limitation. Scatter and box plots were constructed using the "ggplot2" package, 276 and linear regression plots were constructed using the "ggplot2" and "ggpmisc" 277 packages. A correlation heatmap was generated to examine the Pearson correlation 278 between different variables using the "ggcorrplot" package. We conducted a principal 279 components analysis (PCA) for all variables using the "FactoMineR" package.

The main predictors (i.e., interference, abiotic/biotic factors, and metabolic 280 281 limitation) for vector length, vector angle, and CUE_{ST} were identified by a classification 282 random forest (RF) analysis using the "randomForest" package (Breiman, 2001). We 283 estimated the importance of these predictors using the percentage increase in the MSE 284 (mean squared error) of variables. The significance of RF models and predictors was tested using the "rfPermute" and "rfUtilities" packages, respectively. Variation 285 partitioning analysis (VPA) in the "vegan" package was also used to determine the 286 287 contribution of the main predictors to the variation in microbial resource limitation and CUE_{ST}. Furthermore, we used a structural equation model (SEM) to evaluate the 288 289 strength of the direct and indirect relationships between selected variables and 290 microbial resource limitations and CUE_{ST}. The selected variables were significant 291 predictors identified by RF analysis. SEM was performed and fitted using the "lavaan" 292 package, and the model paths were adjusted according to the "modificationIndices" 293 function (Rosseel, 2012). A maximum likelihood estimation method was adopted for SEM. The best-fit model was assessed based on the chi-square test (x^2) , degrees of 294 295 freedom (df), P value, goodness-of-fit index (GFI), standardized root mean square

residual (SRMR), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA).

3. Results

298 *3.1. Soil chemistry, EEAs, and microbial biomass*

299 Overall, the analyses showed that the duration of LR had significant effects on soil 300 nutrients and EEAs and their stoichiometry, whereas aggregate size affected moisture, 301 TP and microbial P (P < 0.05, Table S2). The estimated bulk soil moisture, SOC, TN, 302 and TP contents decreased slightly from LR0 to LR11, peaked at LR26 and then 303 decreased slightly at LR36 (Table S3). The same pattern existed for MBN and MBP, 304 whereas MBC was constant for LR0 and LR11. In general, individual enzyme activities 305 increased from LR0 to LR26 and then declined to their lowest values at LR36. The total 306 activity in bulk soils in which all enzymes were combined also increased from LR0 to 307 LR26 and then declined to the lowest level at LR36. This pattern was also similar for 308 the C-acquiring (BG+CBH), N-acquiring (NAG+LAP), and P-acquiring (AP) groups of enzymes. 309

310 The proportional allocations of the three soil aggregate sizes were approximately 311 equal under current livestock grazing (Table S1). Livestock removal increased the 312 maximum proportion of lma to 52% at LR11, which fell to 18-19% at LR26 and LR36. The proportion of sma fell to a low of 26% at LR11 but then increased to 43% and 62% 313 314 at LR26 and LR36, respectively. The maximum for mia was 39% of the total aggregates 315 at LR26 and then fell to 19% at LR36. Concentrations of soil C, N, and P and microbial 316 C, N and P showed similar patterns of distribution between soil aggregate size classes 317 over time after livestock removal (Table S4). The largest proportions of C, N and P 318 were associated with mia aggregates at LR0, representing 36-46% of the totals. In contrast, the lma aggregates contained 49-71% of the soil and microbial nutrients at 319 320 LR11. Allocations were comparable between the sma and mia classes at LR26, ranging 321 from 39-45% of the totals. Finally, the sma aggregates contained 62-70% of all nutrients

322 at LR36.

The activities of C- and N-acquiring enzymes in soil aggregates were similar to 323 324 bulk soils, generally peaking at LR26 and then decreasing at LR36 (Table 1). The 325 activity of AP in lma and mia increased with the duration of LR, but the lowest AP was 326 in sma of LR36. The patterns of relative enzyme activity among aggregate size classes 327 were similar to those of soil and microbial C distributions. The greatest fraction of C-, 328 N-, and P-acquiring and total enzyme activity was associated with lma aggregates at 329 LR11 (48-58%). However, enzyme activities at LR26 were greatest for the sma fraction 330 (48-52%) and much lower for the lma and mia classes. Additionally, in contrast to 331 microbial and resource distributions, enzyme activities at LR36 were variable; total C-332 acquiring enzyme activities (BG+CBH) were highest for sma aggregates, although 333 CBH was highest for the mia class. The activities of NAG were highest for sma, 334 whereas LAP was highest for mia aggregates. Finally, AP was lowest for sma, and total 335 enzyme activity was similar for all aggregate sizes.

336 3.2. Microbial stoichiometry, homeostasis and imbalances

337 Although microbial biomass in soil varied in bulk soil and between soil aggregate 338 size classes, livestock removal did not have a significant effect on the stoichiometry of 339 microbial biomass. Additionally, stoichiometric imbalances between resources and soil 340 microbial communities were variable but did not show significant effects of LR 341 duration or aggregate size on C:N or C:P (Fig. S1). Imbalances in the C:N ratio between 342 soil resources and microbial biomass averaged approximately 10.2, indicating a much 343 higher C vs. N content in soil than biomass. In contrast, the ratio between C:P elements 344 was very close to 1, indicating a balanced relationship between soil and biomass C vs. 345 P concentrations. The N:P imbalance was the only one affected by LR, averaging

approximately 0.09 overall but achieving a significantly higher peak value of
approximately 0.12 at LR26; thus, the relative P vs. N content of biomass was much
larger than that in soil (Table 1). Finally, linear regression analyses (*H'*) between Ln
(microbial stoichiometry) and Ln (soil resource stoichiometry) revealed no significant
relationships (Fig. S2).

351 3.3. Microbial resource limitations and CUE

352 Despite having no significant effects on the stoichiometry of microbial biomass, 353 both the duration of LR and aggregate size influenced enzyme stoichiometry and 354 estimates of microbial resource limitations, albeit not consistently (Fig. 1). The ratios of Ln(BG):Ln(NAG+LAP), Ln(BG):Ln(AP) and Ln(NAG+LAP):Ln(AP) generally 355 356 decreased to LR26, suggesting declining C and N limitations. However, 357 Ln(BG):Ln(NAG+LAP) and Ln(BG):Ln(AP) achieved their maximum values for sma 358 at LR36. Also, microbial C limitation was generally lower at LR11 and LR26 than at 359 LR0 but showed little difference between aggregate sizes within sites, the exception 360 being that microbial C limitation was significantly higher in sma at LR36. The vector angles for all sites and aggregates were $> 50^\circ$, suggesting an overall P limit to microbial 361 362 metabolism. However, the strength of P limitation varied with both LR and aggregate size, with the lowest values at LR0 and LR26, the highest values at LR36, and the 363 overall higher values in smaller aggregates at all sites except LR26. Thus, soil 364 365 development increased microbial C and P limitation in small aggregates over time after 366 livestock removal. Moreover, linear regression analysis showed a significant positive 367 relationship between vector angle and vector length when pooling all LRs and 368 aggregates, suggesting that microbial P limitation increased with C limitation (Fig. 1D). However, this general relationship was not consistent between aggregate sizes, being 369 370 positive for sma and mia but negative for lma.

371 Estimates of stoichiometric CUE_{ST} were relatively low, generally below 0.2 for all 372 aggregates at all sites (Fig. 2A). However, the duration of LR had a significant effect 373 on the stoichiometric CUE_{ST}, reaching an overall peak at LR26 (0.17 ± 0.02) and then 374 declining to LR36. The differences in CUE_{ST} with different aggregate sizes were 375 inconsistent between sites, although it was interesting that the lowest overall estimate 376 of CUE_{ST} corresponded to the highest estimate of C limitation in small aggregates at 377 LR36. In contrast, the highest estimate of CUE_{ST} was in the lma aggregates at LR11, 378 which did not correspond to any particular environmental or enzyme characteristic, 379 although microbial biomass C was highest. Linear regression analysis showed a 380 significant negative correlation between microbial CUE_{ST} and vector length (P < 0.001, 381 Fig. 2B) as well as vector angle (P < 0.01, Fig. 2C). These general relationships between 382 CUE_{ST} and resource limitations were consistent among the three aggregate sizes. These 383 results suggested that increasing microbial C and especially P limitation during long-384 term LR decreased microbial CUE_{ST}.

385 *3.4. Drivers of microbial resource limitation and CUE and their linkages*

386 The first two axes of the PCA together explained 49.96% of the environmental 387 variation (i.e., soil abiotic and biotic factors) across all LR sites (Fig. 3A). The abiotic 388 and biotic factors at LR26 were significantly different from those at the other sites and 389 between aggregate sizes at this site, indicating that 26 years of LR altered nutrients, 390 enzyme activities, and microbial biomass in soil aggregates in ways that were 391 inconsistent across time and aggregate size. PCA showed that vector length and CUE_{ST} 392 were not strongly related to soil abiotic factors, whereas the vector angle was related to 393 pH and SOC:TN. Microbial CUE_{ST} was negatively correlated with vector length and angle. These results were also confirmed by Pearson correlations (Fig. 3B). At the soil 394 395 aggregate level, linear analysis showed weak correlations between both vector length and vector angle and soil nutrients (C, N, and P) (Fig. S3).

397 We used RF analysis and VPA to reveal contributors to soil microbial metabolism (Fig. 4) and found that the duration of LR was the most important variable predicting 398 399 vector length and angle (Fig. 4A and C). Key variables for predicting vector length also 400 included TN, pH, and MBP; predicting vector angle also included pH, aggregate size, 401 TN, MBP, and moisture. VPA showed that interference (i.e., between LR duration and 402 aggregate size) and abiotic, and biotic factors accounted for 64.0% of the variation in 403 vector length and 83.2% of the variation in vector angle (Fig. 4B and D). However, 404 abiotic factors were the main contributors to variations in both vector length and angle. 405 The majority of variation in vector angle (27.4%) was shared by interference and abiotic 406 factors. Vector length was found to be the most important variable for predicting CUE_{ST} , 407 followed by vector angle and LR (Fig. 4E). Interference, abiotic factors and microbial resource limitation accounted for 43.9% of the variation in microbial CUE_{ST}, with 408 resource limitation (28.5%) being the major contributor (Fig. 4F). 409 410 The SEMs of soil microbial metabolism all yielded adequate fits (Fig. 5, P > 0.05,

411 GFI > 0.9, and RMSEA < 0.08). The duration of LR indirectly affected vector length 412 (microbial C limitation) through pH, TN, and MBP (Fig. 5A). TN (-0.67) and MBP (0.64) exerted significant direct effects on microbial C limitation. The duration of LR 413 414 (0.33) directly affected vector angle (microbial P limitation), whereas aggregate size 415 indirectly affected the angle through moisture, pH, TN, and MBP (Fig. 5B). Soil pH 416 (0.89) was the most important direct factor affecting microbial P limitation, followed 417 by MBP (0.47). The duration of LR indirectly controlled CUE_{ST} by affecting microbial 418 C and P limitations (Fig. 5C). Moreover, microbial C limitation had a greater direct negative impact on CUE_{ST} than P limitation. 419

422 **4. Discussion**

423 4.1. Livestock removal alters microbial resource allocations

424 The current study showed that both microbial biomass and all EEAs were highest 425 at LR11 and LR26 following livestock removal, and both SOC and TN were highest at 426 LR26 (Table 1 and S3). These findings support our first hypothesis, in which livestock 427 removal may increase soil microbial resources and stimulate extracellular enzyme 428 activities. The most likely explanation for this is that livestock removal in these 429 grasslands increased plant litter inputs and diversity, which in turn increased microbial 430 biomass production and extracellular enzyme activities (Kooch et al., 2020; Wang et 431 al., 2020; Oliveira et al., 2021). Indeed, livestock removal increased plant biomass and 432 vegetation diversity by a factor of 3-8 after 25 years in this study area and greatly increased soil nutrients (Zhang et al., 2018). The theory of microbial resource allocation 433 434 suggests that soil EEAs are closely related to resource availability such that an 435 abundance of effective resources can increase enzyme production (Sinsabaugh and Shah, 2012). The positive correlation we found between nutrients and EEAs in soil 436 437 aggregates following livestock removal is consistent with this theory (Fig. 3). However, the intensity of grazing and duration of livestock removal are also key factors affecting 438 439 aboveground biomass and belowground ecology in grasslands and have both positive 440 and negative effects on soil enzymes (Prieto et al., 2011; Olivera et al., 2014). As noted 441 by Zhang et al. (2018), longer-term removal of livestock can reduce plant diversity, 442 productivity, and soil resources. We also found that nutrients, microbial resources and 443 enzyme activity in soil aggregates were greatly reduced after 36 years of livestock removal. This is consistent with the intermediate disturbance hypothesis (IDH) 444 445 (Fensham et al., 2011; Gao and Carmel, 2020; Dong et al., 2021) in that moderate-term 446 livestock removal should produce higher microbial resource production than continued447 livestock grazing or longer-term removal.

The size distributions of soil aggregates also changed with livestock removal 448 449 (Table S1), along with distributions of resources and microbial characteristics among 450 aggregates (Table S4). Livestock removal generally increased the proportion of water-451 stable aggregates (> 0.25 mm), which is basically consistent with reports that grassland 452 vegetation restoration on the Loess Plateau increases soil stability (An et al., 2013; Liu 453 et al., 2021a). The longer duration of LR showed a shift in EEAs and microbial biomass 454 from larger to smaller aggregates (Table S4). However, aggregate size did not 455 significantly affect microbial resource allocation (Table S2). Indeed, the relationship 456 between the internal resources of aggregates and the distribution of microbial resources 457 appears complex, and the theory of resource allocation may not be applicable among 458 aggregate size fractions.

459 4.2. Livestock removal increases microbial resource limitations

460 Vector analysis of enzyme stoichiometry revealed that the duration of LR affected 461 apparent microbial resource limitation in soil aggregates (Fig. 1). The general decrease 462 in overall vector length for all aggregate sizes combined indicated that livestock 463 removal tended to reduce microbial C limitation from LR0 to LR26 (Fig. 1B), which is 464 consistent with increasing plant production (Zhang et al., 2018) and soil nutrient 465 concentrations (Table S3). However, vector length increased again by LR36, at which 466 point plant production and soil nutrients had declined. Thus, the pattern of C limitation 467 during livestock removal also appears to be consistent with the IDH. Reducing livestock 468 grazing over intermediate time periods increases above- and belowground litter inputs as well as labile C inputs from plant roots (Panchal et al., 2022), which provide more 469 470 energy to soil microbes, likely alleviating C limitation and reducing C-acquiring 471 enzyme synthesis (Wardle et al., 2004; Averill and Finzi, 2011; Goenster-Jordan et al.,
472 2021).

Soil nutrients also affected microbial C limitations. In particular, TN was a key 473 474 factor in microbial C limitation in our study, and its increase after livestock removal 475 appeared to alleviate C limitation (Figs. 4A and 5A). An increase in soil nitrogen can 476 provide a positive feedback for plant growth and reduce the C requirement for microbial 477 respiration without altering microbial growth by increasing the availability of high-478 quality C substrates that can be readily assimilated (Spohn et al., 2016). Similarly, soil 479 pH and MBP were also key factors affecting microbial C limitation because changes in 480 relative P demand can in turn affect relative C demand. For example, additions of lime 481 and/or phosphate fertilizers increased microbial C limitation in forests with acidic, P-482 limited soils, likely as a result of reducing P limitation (DeForest and Moorhead, 2020). 483 The C limitation of microorganisms in this study was greatest in small aggregates (sma) 484 at the longest duration, LR36 (Table S4), but was greater in sma than in mia aggregates 485 and thus not clearly related to aggregate sizes or soil resources within aggregates (Fig. 486 S3A) and contrary to expectations based on Cotrufo et al. (2013).

487 The vector angles for soil enzymatic stoichiometry at all sites and for all aggregate sizes were $> 50^{\circ}$ (Fig. 1C), suggesting that microorganisms remained P-limited in all 488 soil aggregates with or without livestock removal. The pattern of change in microbial 489 490 P limitation was generally consistent with that of C limitation; overall, it decreased at 491 LR26 and increased at LR36. We suggest that reasons for this overall response may 492 include the following: 1) P input from livestock manure declines after livestock removal 493 (Sattari et al., 2016), although C input from plants increases, and 2) plant growth requirements increase competition with soil microbes for P (van der Heijden et al., 2008; 494 495 Dijkstra et al., 2015). Direct evidence was provided by the reduction of P content in

496 soil aggregates and microbially available P following livestock removal (Table 1). 497 Moreover, changes in other soil characteristics likely affected the availability of P. One 498 of the main abiotic factors affecting microbial P limitation in soil aggregates was pH, 499 followed by TN and moisture (Figs. 4B and 5B). These factors can affect P 500 bioavailability through a range of P mineralization-related impacts on microbial 501 communities (Zhang et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021) and phosphatase activity (Ragot et 502 al., 2016). However, the distribution of microbial P limitation among different 503 aggregate sizes over time was not easily related to resource allocation (Fig. S3B). The 504 vector angle only decreased at LR26 for the two smallest aggregate sizes (sma and mia) 505 (Fig. 1C). Otherwise, the angle generally increased over the LR duration. Clearly, the 506 reasons for changes in apparent microbial resource limitations (EEAs) among soil 507 aggregate sizes are not simple and require further exploration.

508 Taken together, microbial C and P limitations in soil aggregates were lowest after 509 26 years and highest after 36 years of livestock removal, which is consistent with our 510 second hypothesis, in which controls on resource limitation shift with progressive soil 511 development, although we did not anticipate this nonlinear pattern. The selection of 512 appropriate livestock stocking in semiarid grasslands may be key to controlling soil 513 microbial resource limitation, and the positive relationship between EEA vector length 514 and vector angle (Figs. 1 and 5) indicated that microbial C limitation and P limitation 515 were coupled across soil aggregates (Sinsabaugh et al., 2009; Moorhead et al., 2016). 516 However, some of the overall relationships do not appear to be consistent within and 517 between aggregates. For example, the relationship between C and P limitations was 518 positive for sma and mia but negative for lma across time. This inconsistency is not surprising because the form, quality, and availability of resources are likely to vary 519 among the different sized aggregates, especially as soil aggregates develop over time. 520

521 Nonetheless, we believe that our study is the first to reveal that multiple resource 522 allocations and constraints of microorganisms in semiarid grasslands following grazing 523 exclusion vary among and within the smaller-scale microhabitats of soil aggregates, 524 including size scale differences (Fig. 6).

525 4.3. Mechanisms of microbial C turnover and its implications

526 Patterns of soil microbial stoichiometry indicated relatively stable element 527 homeostasis following long-term livestock removal (Figs. S1 and S2). This is in line 528 with the fact that microorganisms typically exhibit a broad ability to respond to changes 529 in the environment to maintain homeostasis (Sterner and Elser, 2002; Fanin et al., 2013; 530 Mooshammer et al., 2014b). If the stoichiometry of resource supply does not match 531 microbial demands (i.e., stoichiometric imbalance), microorganisms can adapt through 532 multiple mechanisms, such as adjusting extracellular enzyme production and element 533 use efficiency (Sinsabaugh et al., 2009; Mooshammer et al., 2014a; Yuan et al., 2019). 534 The results of correlations between microbial stoichiometric imbalances with soil 535 resource availabilities, vector length/angle, and CUE_{ST} indicated that imbalances within 536 soil aggregates reflected estimated microbial resource limitations and carbon use 537 efficiency (Fig. S4).

The microbial CUE_{ST} in the soil aggregates ranged from 0.10-0.20 (Fig. 2A), 538 539 generally lower than the mean microbial CUE of 0.26 derived from a broad range of 540 ecosystems (Sinsabaugh et al., 2016). Possible explanations for this are that 541 stoichiometric calculations based on total nutrients may lead to an underestimation of 542 CUE (Sinsabaugh et al., 2013; Schimel et al., 2022) or that soil microbial growth in 543 semiarid regions is more susceptible to nutrient limitation and drought (Dijkstra et al., 2015; Yuan et al., 2019; Cui et al., 2021). Long-term LR reduced microbial CUE_{ST} 544 545 compared to moderate LR in soil aggregates (Fig. 2), which is consistent with all three

546 of our hypotheses, likely inextricably linked to changing energy, nutrient and 547 environmental conditions (Fig. 3).

548 Intriguingly, microbial resource limitations became the dominant control of 549 variation in microbial CUE_{ST} among soil aggregates (Fig. 4), which is consistent with 550 the notion that microbial metabolism can effectively control microbial CUE 551 (Mooshammer et al., 2014a; Sinsabaugh et al., 2016; Geyer et al., 2019). Moreover, the 552 pattern of microbial CUE_{ST} across aggregate size was opposite to that of microbial C 553 and P limitations (Fig. 2B and C). For example, an increase in plant litter and root 554 exudates from vegetation regrowth can provide energy to microorganisms and stimulate 555 the priming effect, in turn enhancing the microbial conversion of C (Blagodatskaya and 556 Kuzyakov, 2008; Shahzad et al., 2015). In contrast, our SEM results revealed that 557 increasing microbial C and P limitations with long-term LR reduced microbial CUE_{ST} 558 (Fig. 5C), which specifically supports our third hypothesis and has also been reported 559 in several recent studies (Gai et al., 2021; Feyissa et al., 2022). Resources, such as C 560 and P availability and their stoichiometry are important regulators of microbial CUE, such that microorganisms with limited access to resources may increase their 561 562 investment in enzyme production sustaining growth, which in turn reduces carbon conversion efficiency (Manzoni et al., 2012; Sinsabaugh et al., 2013; Mooshammer et 563 564 al., 2014b; Mehnaz et al., 2019). The relatively low CUE in small soil aggregates (sma) 565 at LR36 may also be due to this reason, i.e., the lowest CUE_{ST} was coincident with the 566 highest vector length and angle.

567 The pattern of C accumulation in soil aggregates during livestock removal was 568 generally consistent with the changing pattern of microbial CUE_{ST} (Fig. 6 and Fig. S5). 569 Higher microbial CUE leads to more C sequestration as microorganisms convert 570 substrate C into microbial biomass (i.e., microbial metabolites, biomass, and necromass) and deposit it in the soil via the 'microbial carbon pump', enhancing a stable soil carbon

572 pool (Miltner et al., 2012; Cotrufo et al., 2013; Liang et al., 2017; Prommer et al., 2020).

573 Moreover, soil development following livestock removal redistributes resources among 574 aggregate size classes, which in turn influences microbial resource limitations in these 575 small-scale microenvironments. In summary, the decline in microbial C conversion 576 efficiency with longer-term livestock removal may reduce the microbial contribution 577 to C storage, which is inextricably linked to increased resource limitation reducing 578 microbial anabolism (Fig. 6). We highlight that microbial C turnover driven by resource 579 limitation can reflect changes in the soil C balance in semiarid grasslands under 580 livestock grazing or removal, which is critical for understanding and exploiting the C 581 sink potential of grasslands in mitigating global climate change.

582 **5.** Conclusions

We found that a moderate duration (~26 years) of livestock removal maximally 583 584 reduced soil microbial resource limitations in semiarid grasslands. Microbial C and P 585 limitations were also coupled in this semiarid grassland, but microbial P limitation varied more significantly between soil aggregate sizes. A nonlinear relationship 586 587 between resource allocation and microbial metabolic limitation within aggregates is likely complicated by the complexity of soil aggregate development. Microbial 588 589 stoichiometric homeostasis and imbalances revealed that microorganisms in soil 590 aggregates maintained relatively consistent element homeostasis between soil and 591 microbial communities during natural grassland restoration, likely by regulating 592 resource acquisition by altering enzyme activities and CUE_{ST}. However, increased 593 microbial metabolic limitations can reduce microbial C turnover under longer-term (~36 years) livestock removal, potentially reducing soil C sequestration. Overall, we 594 595 demonstrated that microbial ecological stoichiometry methods for estimating carbon 596 use efficiency were useful for assessing likely patterns in microbial metabolism and C 597 balance and were applicable to evaluating smaller-scale microhabitats, i.e., soil 598 aggregates. Additional studies are required to further verify the contribution of microbial metabolic limitation to C sequestration in soil aggregates using other methods 599 600 such as functional communities and genes, microbial necromass quantification, stable 601 isotope-labelled microcosm incubation assays, calorimetry and metabolic flux analysis. Further management practices are needed to realize the potential significance of 602 603 semiarid grasslands to the global carbon balance.

604 **Declaration of competing interest**

605 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or 606 personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this 607 paper.

608 Acknowledgements

This work was financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation
of China (41977031), National Funds for Distinguished Young Scientists of Shaanxi
Province (2020JC-31). We would like to thank Elsevier Language Editing Services
(https://webshop.elsevier.com) for English language editing.

- 613 Data availability
- 614 Data will be made available on request.

615 **References**

- An, S.S., Darboux, F., Cheng, M., 2013. Revegetation as an efficient means of
 increasing soil aggregate stability on the Loess Plateau (China). Geoderma 209,
 75-85.
- Averill, C., Finzi, A.C., 2011. Plant regulation of microbial enzyme production *in situ*.
 Soil Biology and Biochemistry 43, 2457-2460.
- Bach, E.M., Hofmockel, K.S., 2014. Soil aggregate isolation method affects measures
 of intra-aggregate extracellular enzyme activity. Soil Biology and Biochemistry
 69, 54-62.
- Bahram, M., Hildebrand, F., Forslund, S.K., Anderson, J.L., Soudzilovskaia, N.A.,
 Bodegom, P.M., Bengtsson-Palme, J., Anslan, S., Coelho, L.P., Harend, H.,
 Huerta-Cepas, J., Medema, M.H., Maltz, M.R., Mundra, S., Olsson, P.A., Pent, M.,
- Polme, S., Sunagawa, S., Ryberg, M., Tedersoo, L., Bork, P., 2018. Structure and
 function of the global topsoil microbiome. Nature 560, 233-237.
- Blagodatskaya, E., Kuzyakov, Y., 2008. Mechanisms of real and apparent priming
 effects and their dependence on soil microbial biomass and community structure:
 critical review. Biology and Fertility of Soils 45, 115-131.
- 632 Breiman, L., 2001. Random forests. Machine Learning 45, 5-32.
- Brookes, P.C., Powlson, D.S., Jenkinson, D.S., 1982. Measurement of microbial
 biomass phosphorus in soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 14, 319-329.
- 635 Camenzind, T., Hattenschwiler, S., Treseder, K.K., Lehmann, A., Rillig, M.C., 2018.
 636 Nutrient limitation of soil microbial processes in tropical forests. Ecological
 637 Monographs 88, 4-21.
- 638 Chen, X.D., Condron, L.M., Dunfield, K.E., Wakelin, S.A., Chen, L.J., 2021. Impact
 639 of grassland afforestation with contrasting tree species on soil phosphorus
 640 fractions and alkaline phosphatase gene communities. Soil Biology and
 641 Biochemistry 159, 108274.
- 642 Cotrufo, M.F., Wallenstein, M.D., Boot, C.M., Denef, K., Paul, E., 2013. The Microbial
 643 Efficiency-Matrix Stabilization (MEMS) framework integrates plant litter
 644 decomposition with soil organic matter stabilization: do labile plant inputs form
 645 stable soil organic matter? Global Change Biology 19, 988-995.
- 646 Cui, Y.X., Moorhead, D.L., Guo, X.B., Peng, S.S., Wang, Y.Q., Zhang, X.C., Fang,
 647 L.C., 2021. Stoichiometric models of microbial metabolic limitation in soil
 648 systems. Global Ecology and Biogeography 30, 2297-2311.
- 649 DeForest, J.L., Moorhead, D.L., 2020. Effects of elevated pH and phosphorus fertilizer
 650 on soil C, N and P enzyme stoichiometry in an acidic mixed mesophytic deciduous
 651 forest. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 150, 107996.
- Dijkstra, F.A., He, M.Z., Johansen, M.P., Harrison, J.J., Keitel, C., 2015. Plant and
 microbial uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus affected by drought using ¹⁵N and
 ³²P tracers. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 82, 135-142.

- Dong, L., Martinsen, V., Wu, Y.T., Zheng, Y., Liang, C.Z., Liu, Z.L., Mulder, J., 2021.
 Effect of grazing exclusion and rotational grazing on labile soil organic carbon in
 north China. European Journal of Soil Science 72, 372-384.
- Fanin, N., Fromin, N., Buatois, B., Hattenschwiler, S., 2013. An experimental test of
 the hypothesis of non-homeostatic consumer stoichiometry in a plant littermicrobe
 system. Ecology Letters 16, 764-772.
- Fensham, R.J., Silcock, J.L., Dwyer, J.M., 2011. Plant species richness responses to
 grazing protection and degradation history in a low productivity landscape.
 Journal of Vegetation Science 22, 997-1008.
- Feyissa, A., Gurmesa, G.A., Yang, F., Long, C.Y., Zhang, Q., Cheng, X.L., 2022. Soil
 enzyme activity and stoichiometry in secondary grasslands along a climatic
 gradient of subtropical China. Science of the Total Environment 825, 154019.
- Gai, X., Li, S.C., Zhang, X.P., Bian, F.Y., Yang, C.B., Zhong, Z.K., 2021. Effects of
 chicken farming on soil extracellular enzyme activity and microbial nutrient
 limitation in Lei bamboo forest (*Phyllostachys praecox*) in subtropical China.
 Applied Soil Ecology 168, 104106.
- Gao, J.J., Carmel, Y., 2020. Can the intermediate disturbance hypothesis explain
 grazing-diversity relations at a global scale? Oikos 129, 493-502.
- 673 Geyer, K.M., Dijkstra, P., Sinsabaugh, R., Frey, S.D., 2019. Clarifying the
 674 interpretation of carbon use efficiency in soil through methods comparison. Soil
 675 Biology and Biochemistry 128, 79-88.
- 676 Goenster-Jordan, S., Ingold, M., Jannoura, R., Buerkert, A., Joergensen, R.G., 2021.
 677 Soil microbial properties of subalpine steppe soils at different grazing intensities
 678 in the Chinese Altai Mountains. Scientific Reports 11, 1653.
- Jing, Z.B., Cheng, J.M., Su, J.H., Bai, Y., Jin, J.W., 2014. Changes in plant community
 composition and soil properties under 3-decade grazing exclusion in semiarid
 grassland. Ecological Engineering 64, 171-178.
- 682Joergensen, R.G., Mueller, T., 1996. The fumigation-extraction method to estimate soil683microbial biomass: Calibration of the $k_{\rm EN}$ value. Soil Biology and Biochemistry68428, 25-31.
- Kooch, Y., Moghimian, N., Wirth, S., Noghre, N., 2020. Effects of grazing
 management on leaf litter decomposition and soil microbial activities in northern
 Iranian rangeland. Geoderma 361, 114100.
- Liang, C., Schimel, J.P., Jastrow, J.D., 2017. The importance of anabolism in microbial
 control over soil carbon storage. Nature Microbiology 2, 17105.
- Liu, D.D., Ju, W.L., Jin, X.L., Li, M.D., Shen, G.T., Duan, C.J., Guo, L., Liu, Y.Y.,
 Zhao, W., Fang, L.C., 2021a. Associated soil aggregate nutrients and controlling
 factors on aggregate stability in semiarid grassland under different grazing
 prohibition timeframes. Science of the Total Environment 777, 146104.
- 694 Liu, X.J.A., Pold, G., Domeignoz-Horta, L.A., Geyer, K.M., Caris, H., Nicolson, H.,

695 Kemner, K.M., Frey, S.D., Melillo, J.M., DeAngelis, K.M., 2021b. Soil aggregate-696 mediated microbial responses to long-term warming. Soil Biology and 697 Biochemistry 152, 108055. 698 Manzoni, S., Taylor, P., Richter, A., Porporato, A., Agren, G.I., 2012. Environmental 699 and stoichiometric controls on microbial carbon-use efficiency in soils. New 700 Phytologist 196, 79-91. 701 Marx, M.C., Wood, M., Jarvis, S.C., 2001. A microplate fluorimetric assay for the study of enzyme diversity in soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 33, 1633-1640. 702 703 Mehnaz, K.R., Corneo, P.E., Keitel, C., Dijkstra, F.A., 2019. Carbon and phosphorus 704 addition effects on microbial carbon use efficiency, soil organic matter priming, gross nitrogen mineralization and nitrous oxide emission from soil. Soil Biology 705 706 and Biochemistry 134, 175-186. 707 Miltner, A., Bombach, P., Schmidt-Brucken, B., Kastner, M., 2012. SOM genesis: 708 microbial biomass as a significant source. Biogeochemistry 111, 41-55. 709 Moorhead, D.L., Sinsabaugh, R.L., Hill, B.H., Weintraub, M.N., 2016. Vector analysis 710 of ecoenzyme activities reveal constraints on coupled C, N and P dynamics. Soil 711 Biology and Biochemistry 93, 1-7. 712 Mooshammer, M., Wanek, W., Hammerle, I., Fuchslueger, L., Hofhansl, F., Knoltsch, 713 A., Schnecker, J., Takriti, M., Watzka, M., Wild, B., Keiblinger, K.M., Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., Richter, A., 2014a. Adjustment of microbial nitrogen 714 715 use efficiency to carbon: nitrogen imbalances regulates soil nitrogen cycling. 716 Nature Communications 5, 3694. 717 Mooshammer, M., Wanek, W., Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., Richter, A., 2014b. 718 Stoichiometric imbalances between terrestrial decomposer communities and their 719 resources: mechanisms and implications of microbial adaptations to their 720 resources. Frontiers in Microbiology 5. 721 Nannipieri, P., Kandeler, E., Ruggiero, P., 2002. Enzyme activities and microbiological 722 and biochemical processes in soil. 723 Oliveira, A.D.N., deSousa, L.I.S., da Costa, V.A.S., deAndrade, J.V.T., Lima, L.A.L., 724 de Sales, P.A.F., da Silva, D.F., Pereira, A.P.D., Melo, V.M.M., 2021. Long-term 725 effects of grazing on the biological, chemical, and physical soil properties of the 726 Caatinga biome. Microbiological Research 253, 126893. Olivera, N.L., Prieto, L., Carrera, A.L., Cisneros, H.S., Bertiller, M.B., 2014. Do soil 727 728 enzymes respond to long-term grazing in an arid ecosystem? Plant and Soil 378, 729 35-48. 730 Panchal, P., Preece, C., Penuelas, J., Giri, J., 2022. Soil carbon sequestration by root 731 exudates. Trends in plant science 27, 749-757. 732 Prieto, L.H., Bertiller, M.B., Carrera, A.L., Olivera, N.L., 2011. Soil enzyme and 733 microbial activities in a grazing ecosystem of Patagonian Monte, Argentina. 734 Geoderma 162, 281-287.

- Prommer, J., Walker, T.W.N., Wanek, W., Braun, J., Zezula, D., Hu, Y.T., Hofhansl,
 F., Richter, A., 2020. Increased microbial growth, biomass, and turnover drive soil
 organic carbon accumulation at higher plant diversity. Global Change Biology 26,
 669-681.
- Ragot, S.A., Huguenin-Elie, O., Kertesz, M.A., Frossard, E., Bunemann, E.K., 2016.
 Total and active microbial communities and *phoD* as affected by phosphate
 depletion and pH in soil. Plant and Soil 408, 15-30.
- Rosseel, Y., 2012. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. Journal of
 Statistical Software 48, 1-36.
- Roy, S., Bagchi, S., 2021. Large Mammalian Herbivores and the Paradox of Soil
 Carbon in Grazing Ecosystems: Role of Microbial Decomposers and Their
 Enzymes. Ecosystems 25, 976-988.
- Saiya-Cork, K.R., Sinsabaugh, R.L., Zak, D.R., 2002. The effects of long term nitrogen
 deposition on extracellular enzyme activity in an Acer saccharum forest soil. Soil
 Biology and Biochemistry 34, 1309-1315.
- Sattari, S.Z., Bouwman, A.F., Rodriguez, R.M., Beusen, A.H.W., van Ittersum, M.K.,
 2016. Negative global phosphorus budgets challenge sustainable intensification of
 grasslands. Nature Communications 7, 10696.
- Schimel, J., Weintraub, M.N., Moorhead, D., 2022. Estimating microbial carbon use
 efficiency in soil: Isotope-based and enzyme-based methods measure
 fundamentally different aspects of microbial resource use. Soil Biology and
 Biochemistry 169, 108677.
- Schutter, M.E., Dick, R.P., 2002. Microbial community profiles and activities among
 aggregates of winter fallow and cover-cropped soil. Soil Science Society of
 America Journal 66, 142-153.
- Shahzad, T., Chenu, C., Genet, P., Barot, S., Perveen, N., Mougin, C., Fontaine, S.,
 2015. Contribution of exudates, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and litter
 depositions to the rhizosphere priming effect induced by grassland species. Soil
 Biology and Biochemistry 80, 146-155.
- Sinsabaugh, R.L., Hill, B.H., Shah, J.J.F., 2009. Ecoenzymatic stoichiometry of
 microbial organic nutrient acquisition in soil and sediment. Nature 462, 795-798.
- Sinsabaugh, R.L., Manzoni, S., Moorhead, D.L., Richter, A., 2013. Carbon use
 efficiency of microbial communities: stoichiometry, methodology and modelling.
 Ecology Letters 16, 930-939.
- Sinsabaugh, R.L., Shah, J.J.F., 2012. Ecoenzymatic Stoichiometry and Ecological
 Theory, In: Futuyma, D.J. (Ed.), Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and
 Systematics, Vol 43, pp. 313-343.
- Sinsabaugh, R.L., Turner, B.L., Talbot, J.M., Waring, B.G., Powers, J.S., Kuske, C.R.,
 Moorhead, D.L., Shah, J.J.F., 2016. Stoichiometry of microbial carbon use
 efficiency in soils. Ecological Monographs 86, 172-189.

- Spohn, M., Potsch, E.M., Eichorst, S.A., Woebken, D., Wanek, W., Richter, A., 2016.
 Soil microbial carbon use efficiency and biomass turnover in a long-term
 fertilization experiment in a temperate grassland. Soil Biology and Biochemistry
 97, 168-175.
- Sterner, R.W., Elser, J.J., 2002. Ecological Stoichiometry: The Biology of Elements
 From Molecules to The Biosphere. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- van der Heijden, M.G.A., Bardgett, R.D., van Straalen, N.M., 2008. The unseen
 majority: soil microbes as drivers of plant diversity and productivity in terrestrial
 ecosystems. Ecology Letters 11, 296-310.
- Vance, E.D., Brookes, P.C., Jenkinson, D.S., 1987. An extraction method for measuring
 soil microbial biomass C. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 19, 703-707.
- Wang, J., Wang, X.T., Liu, G.B., Wang, G.L., Wu, Y., Zhang, C., 2020. Fencing as an
 effective approach for restoration of alpine meadows: Evidence from nutrient
 limitation of soil microbes. Geoderma 363, 114148.
- Wang, R.Z., Dorodnikov, M., Yang, S., Zhang, Y.Y., Filley, T.R., Turco, R.F., Zhang,
 Y.G., Xu, Z.W., Li, H., Jiang, Y., 2015. Responses of enzymatic activities within
 soil aggregates to 9-year nitrogen and water addition in a semi-arid grassland. Soil
 Biology and Biochemistry 81, 159-167.
- Wardle, D.A., Bardgett, R.D., Klironomos, J.N., Setala, H., van der Putten, W.H., Wall,
 D.H., 2004. Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota.
 Science 304, 1629-1633.
- Wiesmeier, M., Munro, S., Barthold, F., Steffens, M., Schad, P., Kogel-Knabner, I.,
 2015. Carbon storage capacity of semi-arid grassland soils and sequestration
 potentials in northern China. Global Change Biology 21, 3836-3845.
- Wilpiszeski, R.L., Aufrecht, J.A., Retterer, S.T., Sullivan, M.B., Graham, D.E., Pierce,
 E.M., Zablocki, O.D., Palumbo, A.V., Elias, D.A., 2019. Soil Aggregate Microbial
 Communities: Towards Understanding Microbiome Interactions at Biologically
 Relevant Scales. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 85.
- Wilson, C.H., Strickland, M.S., Hutchings, J.A., Bianchi, T.S., Flory, S.L., 2018.
 Grazing enhances belowground carbon allocation, microbial biomass, and soil
 carbon in a subtropical grassland. Global Change Biology 24, 2997-3009.
- Yuan, X.B., Niu, D.C., Gherardi, L.A., Liu, Y.B., Wang, Y., Elser, J.J., Fu, H., 2019.
 Linkages of stoichiometric imbalances to soil microbial respiration with
 increasing nitrogen addition: Evidence from a long-term grassland experiment.
 Soil Biology and Biochemistry 138, 107580.
- 810 Zhang, C., Liu, G.B., Song, Z.L., Wang, J., Guo, L., 2018. Interactions of soil bacteria
 811 and fungi with plants during long-term grazing exclusion in semiarid grasslands.
 812 Soil Biology and Biochemistry 124, 47-58.

813 Figure and table captions:

- Fig. 1 The ecoenzymatic vector model quantifies microbial resource limitation in soil
 aggregates.
- Fig. 2 Microbial CUE in soil aggregates and their linear relationship with vectoranalysis.
- 818 Fig. 3 The relationships between microbial resource limitation and CUE and soil

819 properties, extracellular enzyme activities, and microbial biomass.

- 820 Fig. 4 Potential drivers of variation in microbial resource limitation and CUE in soil
- 821 aggregates after livestock removal.
- 822 Fig. 5 Results from the structural equation model illustrating the major pathways of
- 823 influencing factors on microbial resource limitation and CUE.
- 824 Fig. 6 Conceptual diagram of microbial resource limitation and carbon conversion
- 825 patterns in semiarid grassland soil aggregates following long-term livestock removal.
- 826 Table 1 Soil chemistry, EEAs, and microbial biomass in soil aggregates during

827 livestock removal.



Fig. 1 The ecoenzymatic vector model quantifies microbial resource limitation in soil 829 830 aggregates. Relationships between Ln(BG)/Ln(NAG+LAP) versus Ln(BG)/Ln(AP) in 831 soil aggregates at all sites (A). Vector length represents microbial C limitation (B) and 832 vector angle represents microbial N or P nutrient limitation (C). Linear relationships 833 between vector length and vector angle (D). BG, β -1,4-glucosidase; NAG, β -1,4-N-834 acetylglucosaminidase; LAP, L-leucine aminopeptidase; and AP, alkaline phosphatase. 835 lma, large macroaggregates, > 2 mm; sma, small macroaggregates, 2-0.25 mm; and 836 mia, microaggregates, < 0.25 mm. (B) and (C), Different lowercase letters indicate 837 statistical differences (Tukey's HSD test, P < 0.05) between different sites for the same 838 sized aggregates.





Fig. 2 Microbial CUE in soil aggregates and their linear relationship with vector analysis. (A), Box plots showing changes in microbial carbon use efficiency (CUE) from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}) in soil aggregates during long-term livestock removal. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical differences (Tukey's HSD test, *P* < 0.05) between different sites for the same sized aggregates. Linear regression showing the relationship between microbial CUE_{ST} and vector length (B) and vector angle (C).

33

This preprint research paper has not been peer reviewed. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4264594



Fig. 3 The relationship between microbial resource limitation and CUE and soil properties, extracellular enzyme activities, and microbial biomass. (A), Principal component analysis (PCA); and (B), correlation heatmaps based on Pearson correlation analysis. Soil properties included pH, moisture, SOC, TN, and TP; extracellular enzyme activities included BG, CBH, NAG, LAP, and AP; and microbial biomass included MBC, MBN, and MBP. Vector length and vector angle represent microbial resource limitation; CUE represents microbial carbon use efficiency from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}).



855Fig. 4 Potential drivers of variation in microbial resource limitation and CUE in soil aggregates after livestock removal. Random forest856(RF) analysis predicts the importance (percentage of increase in mean square error) of variables as drivers for vector length (A), vector857angle (C), and microbial CUE (E). Percentage increases in the MSE (mean squared error) of variables were used to estimate the importance858of these predictors, and higher MSE% values imply more important predictors. Significance levels are as follows: * P < 0.05 and ** P <8590.01. Variation partitioning analysis (VPA) showing the contribution of interference and soil abiotic and biotic factors to variation in vector860length (B), vector angle (D), and microbial CUE (F). Vector length represents microbial C limitation, and vector angle represents microbial861P vs. N limitation; microbial CUE represents microbial carbon use efficiency from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}).





863 Fig. 5 Results from the structural equation model illustrating the major pathways of influencing 864 factors on microbial resource limitation and CUE. Structural equation model (SEM) for vector length (A), vector angle (B), and microbial CUE (C). Vector length represents microbial C 865 866 limitation, and vector angle represents microbial P vs. N limitation. Microbial CUE represents 867 microbial carbon use efficiency from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}). The solid blue lines 868 represent direct positive impacts, and the solid red lines represent direct negative impacts. The 869 double-headed arrows indicate interactions between variables. Dotted lines represent indirect 870 effects. Please refer to the statistical analysis for the definitions of parameters represented by 871 the SEM fit.



873 Fig. 6 Conceptual diagram of microbial resource limitation and carbon conversion patterns in 874 semiarid grassland soil aggregates following long-term livestock removal. Microbial resource 875 limitations affect microbial CUE and thus C sequestration. Vector analysis (vector length and 876 vector angle) of soil extracellular enzyme activities is used to quantify microbial resource 877 limitations. Microbial carbon use efficiency (CUE) is estimated from stoichiometry theory (CUE_{ST}). The effects of interference, biotic factors, and abiotic factors on vector length and 878 879 vector angle are based on VPA, SEM and correlation analysis. Interference included the 880 duration of livestock removal and soil aggregate size; abiotic factors included pH, moisture, 881 SOC, TN, and TP; and biotic factors included MBC, MBN, and MBP. Ima, large 882 macroaggregates, > 2 mm; sma, small macroaggregates, 2-0.25 mm; and mia, microaggregates, < 0.25 mm. 883

	C '+ (• 1• , 1	1)									
Characteristics	Sites (years s	ince livestock re	emoval)	I D 1 1			1026			1 D 2 6		
Characteristics	lma	sma	mia	lma	sma	mia	lma	sma	mia	lma	sma	mia
	7.96 ± 0.06	7.96 ± 0.03	8.00 ± 0.05	8.01 ± 0.04	7.96 ± 0.02	8.00 ± 0.02	7.87 ± 0.02	7.77 ± 0.03	7.85 ± 0.01	8.06 ± 0.02	8.00 ± 0.01	8.03 ± 0.01
рН	bc	a	а	ab	а	a	c	b	b	a	a	а
Moisture (%)	20.6 ± 0.40	19.8 ± 0.18	11.6 ± 0.44	21.0 ± 0.88	21.5 ± 0.56	17.7 ± 0.38	23.6 ± 0.45	24.0 ± 0.11	17.9 ± 0.10	18.5 ± 0.32	19.3 ± 0.32	23.2 ± 0.38
	b 29.7 \pm 1.19	c 20.1 \pm 0.74	c 22.6 ± 1.62	b 28.8 ± 0.04	b 21.0 ± 1.20	b 20.0 ± 0.72	a 27.1 ± 0.41	a 20.8 ± 0.47	b 28.7 ± 1.44	c 21.7 + 1.06	c 22.7 ± 1.22	a 22 7 ± 1 24
SOC (g kg ⁻¹)	20.7 ± 1.10	29.1 ± 0.74	32.0 ± 1.02	28.8 ± 0.04	31.9 ± 1.39	30.9 ± 0.72	37.1 ± 0.41	39.0 ± 0.47	36.7 ± 1.44	31.7 ± 1.00	32.7 ± 1.22	33.7 ± 1.34
TNI (1 -1)	2.69 ± 0.03	2.89 ± 0.03	3.02 ± 0.05	2.84 ± 0.03	2.91 ± 0.04	2.87 ± 0.09	3.65 ± 0.06	3.86 ± 0.06	3.85 ± 0.02	2.90 ± 0.04	3.08 ± 0.03	2.86 ± 0.03
$IN (g kg^{-1})$	с	с	b	b	с	с	а	а	а	b	b	с
$TP(\sigma k\sigma^{-1})$	0.93 ± 0.02	0.93 ± 0.03	0.93 ± 0.03	0.85 ± 0.12	0.95 ± 0.02	0.93 ± 0.03	0.90 ± 0.12	1.04 ± 0.02	0.99 ± 0.03	0.87 ± 0.04	0.95 ± 0.03	0.89 ± 0.06
11 (8-8)	a	b	ab	a	b	ab	a	a	a	a	b	b
SOC:TN	10.7 ± 0.36	10.1 ± 0.1 /	10.8 ± 0.70	10.1 ± 0.09	11.0 ± 0.49	10.8 ± 0.23	10.2 ± 0.27	10.3 ± 0.26	10.1 ± 0.34	10.9 ± 0.25	10.6 ± 0.45	11.8 ± 0.50
	30.8 ± 1.28	31.3 ± 1.37	34.9 ± 2.21	34.3 ± 5.13	33.4 ± 1.74	33.3 ± 1.97	41.9 ± 5.78	38.3 ± 0.52	39.1 ± 2.07	36.3 ± 1.06	34.5 ± 0.67	38.1 ± 1.87
SOC:TP	b	c	ab	ab	bc	b	a	a	a	ab	b	ab
TN·TP	2.89 ± 0.03	3.11 ± 0.14	3.24 ± 0.08	3.38 ± 0.50	3.05 ± 0.02	3.09 ± 0.20	4.12 ± 0.58	3.72 ± 0.11	3.89 ± 0.12	3.32 ± 0.14	3.26 ± 0.11	3.24 ± 0.23
110.11	b	b	b	ab	b	b	a 120 / 10 /	a 157 - 654	a	ab	b	b
BG (nmol g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹)	$12/\pm 13.8$	$136 \pm 1/.3$	$10/\pm 10.8$	$11/\pm 19.1$	109 ± 1.86	76.9 ± 1.71	129 ± 10.4	$15/\pm 6.54$	98.8 ± 9.00	101 ± 7.30	68.6 ± 11.3	130 ± 14.3
	$a 36.5 \pm 12.8$	47.9 ± 12.1	41.4 ± 9.73	36.0 ± 4.84	35.9 ± 15.7	17.7 ± 9.29	$a 64.9 \pm 11.9$	a 55.7 ± 7.57	30.1 ± 18.3	32.0 ± 3.35	7.95 ± 1.30	38.5 ± 6.14
CBH (nmol $g^{-1} h^{-1}$)	b	a 12.11	a	b	a	a	a	a	a 10.0	b	b	a
NAG (nmol σ^{-1} h ⁻¹)	4.97 ± 1.16	7.47 ± 1.36	5.23 ± 0.35	6.46 ± 2.32	5.80 ± 0.90	3.32 ± 1.93	11.4 ± 0.37	20.2 ± 3.24	12.4 ± 2.77	10.1 ± 2.73	11.1 ± 1.99	12.2 ± 1.17
initia (initia g in)	c	b	b	bc	b	b	a	a	a	ab	b	a
LAP (nmol g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹)	47.3 ± 3.49	42.1 ± 3.54	32.2 ± 2.18	55.1 ± 9.56	50.4 ± 5.44	32.0 ± 6.02	54.3 ± 7.59	61.9 ± 4.33	40.7 ± 4.04	41.0 ± 2.88	0.88 ± 0.38	37.0 ± 3.51
	a 152 + 28.6	$\frac{1}{227} + 175$	a 165 ± 6.37	a $222 + 264$	302 + 19.0	a $199 + 38.2$	a $261 + 30.7$	a $274 + 38.9$	a 210 ± 20.3	a $344 + 32.8$	$\frac{1}{737}$ + 725	$\frac{a}{362 + 3.46}$
AP (nmol $g^{-1} h^{-1}$)	102 ± 20.0	b	b	bc	a	b	b	ab	b	a	c	a
BG(NAG+IAP)	2.42 ± 0.18	2.75 ± 0.32	2.86 ± 0.32	1.93 ± 0.43	1.95 ± 0.20	2.25 ± 0.53	1.97 ± 0.08	1.92 ± 0.02	1.87 ± 0.13	1.98 ± 0.09	5.89 ± 1.45	2.65 ± 0.20
DO.(NAO+LAI)	а	b	а	а	b	ab	а	b	b	а	а	ab
BG:AP	0.87 ± 0.28	0.60 ± 0.05	0.65 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.15	0.36 ± 0.03	0.39 ± 0.06	0.50 ± 0.04	0.58 ± 0.10	0.48 ± 0.07	0.29 ± 0.01	0.94 ± 0.21	0.36 ± 0.04
	a 0.36 ± 0.09	0.22 ± 0.01	$a 0 23 \pm 0.01$	ab 0.28 + 0.03	$0 19 \pm 0.01$	$0 18 \pm 0.03$	0.25 ± 0.02	0 30 + 0.04	0.26 ± 0.05	$0 15 \pm 0.01$	a 0.16 ± 0.02	0 14 + 0.01
(NAG+LAP):AP	a	b	ab	ab	bc	bc	ab	a	a	b	0.10 ± 0.02 C	0.14 ± 0.01 C
MPC (mg kg ⁻¹)	188 ± 50.0	223 ± 36.7	297 ± 25.7	448 ± 50.2	228 ± 54.9	165 ± 56.7	290 ± 63.2	324 ± 19.7	349 ± 42.7	205 ± 46.0	360 ± 50.0	294 ± 90.8
MBC (ling kg)	b	b	ab	а	b	b	b	ab	а	b	а	ab
MBN (mg kg ⁻¹)	219 ± 12.4	252 ± 8.54	255 ± 12.8	259 ± 7.14	227 ± 14.4	205 ± 16.1	270 ± 11.9	300 ± 2.29	295 ± 15.9	254 ± 15.1	262 ± 8.22	251 ± 8.16
	565 ± 0.62	733 ± 0.76	692 ± 0.67	a 4.64 ± 0.16	c 6 66 + 0 49	c 6.14 ± 0.31	a 8.11 ± 0.62	a 854 ± 0.45	a 9.93 ± 0.50	a 5.55 ± 0.19	$0 7 90 \pm 0.27$	b 7.09 ± 1.11
MBP (mg kg ⁻¹)	b.05 ± 0.02	ab	b	+.0 - ± 0.10 b	b	b 0.14 ± 0.01	aa.	a	a.	b	ab	b
MDC-MDN	0.86 ± 0.21	0.88 ± 0.11	1.17 ± 0.12	1.73 ± 0.19	0.99 ± 0.20	0.82 ± 0.32	1.08 ± 0.27	1.08 ± 0.07	1.19 ± 0.16	0.80 ± 0.13	1.38 ± 0.20	1.16 ± 0.38
MIDC:MIDIN	b	b	а	a	ab	a	b	ab	a	b	a	а
MBC:MBP	34.2 ± 11.8	31.0 ± 8.31	43.4 ± 7.94	96.9 ± 13.4	33.9 ± 6.11	26.6 ± 7.77	35.9 ± 7.95	38.1 ± 4.14	35.2 ± 4.10	36.7 ± 7.06	45.6 ± 6.31	41.9 ± 15.0

884	Table 1 Soil o	chemistry,	EEAs, and	l microbial	biomass	in soil	aggregates	during	livestock rem	oval.
-----	----------------	------------	-----------	-------------	---------	---------	------------	--------	---------------	-------

		b	а	а	а	а	а	b	а	а	b	a	а
MBN	MDNIMDD	39.0 ± 4.88	34.7 ± 4.66	37.1 ± 3.64	55.8 ± 1.81	34.2 ± 0.86	33.5 ± 3.88	33.5 ± 4.02	35.2 ± 1.64	29.8 ± 3.12	45.8 ± 1.26	33.1 ± 0.39	36.0 ± 5.49
	MBN:MBP	bc	а	а	а	а	а	с	а	а	b	a	a

Note: LR0, 0 years of livestock removal, control; LR11, 11 years of livestock removal; LR26, 26 years of livestock removal; and LR36, 36 years of livestock removal. Ima, large macroaggregates, > 2 mm; sma, small macroaggregates, 2-0.25 mm; and mi, microaggregates, < 0.25 mm. SOC, soil organic carbon; TN, total nitrogen; TP, total phosphorus, BG, β -1,4-glucosidase; CBH, β -D-cellobiosidase; NAG, β -1,4-N-acetylglucosaminidase; LAP, L-leucine aminopeptidase; AP, alkaline phosphatase; MBC, microbial biomass C; MBN, microbial biomass N; and MBP, microbial biomass P. Different lowercase letters stand for statistical differences (Tukey's HSD test, *P* < 0.05) between different sites for similar size aggregates.