Forest disturbance impacts on soil and litter fauna: knowledge gaps and a roadmap for future research

Authors: Philip A. Martin[1,2], Leticia Pérez Izquierdo[1,3], Charlotte Biryol[4], Solene Brasseur[4], Claire Menival[4], Qian Li[5], Inti Luna Aviles[6], Ion Catalin Petritan[7], Sebastiaan Luyssaert[8], Bertrand Geunet[9], Stefano Manzoni[10], Rebecca Spake[11], Mathieu Santonja[4], Jorge Curiel Yuste[1,2].

1. Basque Centre for Climate Change (BC3), Edificio sede nº 1, planta 1, Parque científico UPV/EHU, Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940, Leioa, Bizkaia, Spain.
2. IKERBASQUE – Basque Foundation for Science, Plaza Euskadi 5, E-48009, Bilbao, Bizkaia, Spain
3. Department of Soil, Plant and Environmental Quality, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, ICA-CSIC, Madrid, Spain
4. Aix Marseille Univ, Avignon Univ, CNRS, IRD, IMBE, Marseille, France
5. Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Latokartanonkaari 9, 00790 Helsinki, Finland
6. Image Processing Laboratory (IPL), Parque Científico - Campus de Paterna, University of Valencia, 46980 Paterna, Valencia, Spain
7. Department of Forest Engineering, Forest Management Planning and Terrestrial Measurements, Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering, Transilvania University of Braşov, Braşov, Romania
8. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Faculty of Science, Department of Ecological Science, De Boelelaan 1085, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
9. Laboratoire de Géologie, UMR 8538, Ecole Normale Supérieure, IPSL, PSL Research University, CNRS, Paris, France
10. Department of Physical Geography and Bolin Centre for Climate Research, Stockholm University, SE-106 91, Stockholm, Sweden.
11. School of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Southampton, UK

Lead author email address: phil.martin.research@gmail.com

Abstract

Natural disturbances such as fires, droughts, windthrow, and pest outbreaks are increasing in frequency and severity, placing new pressures on forest ecosystems. Impacts on aboveground biodiversity are well understood, but effects on belowground communities - particularly soil and litter invertebrate fauna - remain understudied. Given the vast diversity of soil organisms, forest types, and disturbance regimes, it is difficult to assess what has and has not been studied, creating major barriers for both new empirical work and meta-analyses. To address this knowledge gap, we conducted a systematic map to characterise global research on the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna. This identified 308 primary studies, from 48 countries, covering 24 taxonomic orders of soil and litter fauna. We found that most studies focused on fire, while precipitation change, windthrow, and pests/pathogens were underrepresented. By accounting for the area of each forest biome impacted by the different disturbances, we revealed a worrying bias: despite being widely affected by natural disturbances, tropical and boreal forests remain under-studied compared to temperate and Mediterranean regions. We also found that research predominantly focussed on meso- and macrofauna (e.g. springtails and beetles), with relatively few studies on microfauna such as nematodes. For a subset of taxa we compared the number of sites per taxon with global estimates of biomass and found that important groups, such as nematodes, termites, and earthworms are substantially underrepresented. Most studies assessed abundance or alpha diversity, with few studies examining more complex outcomes such as food web structure. Observational designs dominated studies of fire, windthrow, and pests and pathogens while studies of precipitation change often used experimental approaches. Study durations were generally short, and reporting disturbance intensity was inconsistent - except for precipitation experiments, where it was more common. Based on our findings, we constructed a roadmap for improving understanding of forest disturbance impacts on soil faunal biodiversity and the essential functions it supports, which we hope will be valuable both for researchers producing primary studies and those conducting meta-analyses.

Keywords
Soil animals; evidence synthesis; fire; precipitation change; drought; insect pests; plant pathogens; windthrow

Introduction

The frequency, extent, and intensity of natural disturbances in forests, such as fires (Pechony & Shindell, 2010), droughts (Clark *et al.*, 2016; Feldpausch *et al.*, 2016), windthrow (Patacca *et al.*, 2023), and insect and pathogen outbreaks (Ju *et al.*, 2015) are increasing in many forest biomes. This increase in disturbance is largely attributable to anthropogenic climate change and altered land-use practices. For example, warmer and drier conditions lead to more intense droughts and fires, while intensification in land use can promote accidental fires (Barlow *et al.*, 2020; Lapola *et al.*, 2023). Warmer, drier conditions can also promote insect outbreaks, while warmer and wetter conditions are linked to increased wind and pathogen disturbances (Seidl *et al.*, 2017). Increases in disturbance intensity can drastically change forest structure (Jacquet, Orazio & Jactel, 2012), reduce carbon storage (Seidl *et al.*, 2014), and alter biodiversity (Viljur *et al.*, 2022), representing a major challenge for forest management (Patacca *et al.*, 2023; Lecina-Diaz *et al.*, 2024). Therefore, understanding the impacts of these disturbances on forest biodiversity and ecosystem services is crucial for developing strategies to reduce their negative impacts (Lecina-Diaz *et al.*, 2024).

While the impacts of natural disturbances on aboveground forest biodiversity are well documented (Viljur *et al.*, 2022; Lecina-Diaz *et al.*, 2024), our understanding of threats to belowground biodiversity remains limited (Phillips *et al.*, 2017). Much of the research on the impacts of global change and disturbances on belowground communities has focussed on microorganisms, while soil and litter invertebrate fauna have been studied less frequently. For instance, studies investigating global change impacts on soil microbes outnumber those on soil fauna by a factor of five (Zhou, Wang & Luo, 2020; Peng *et al.*, 2022). This disparity is particularly striking given the extraordinary abundance and diversity of soil fauna. Just three taxa, nematodes (van den Hoogen *et al.*, 2019), springtails (Potapov *et al.*, 2023), and earthworms (Phillips *et al.*, 2019) - have an estimated combined global biomass approximately 28 times higher than that of all wild terrestrial vertebrates (Bar-On, Phillips & Milo, 2018), and represent more than 30 times as many species (Pillay *et al.*, 2022; Anthony, Bender & van der Heijden, 2023).

As well as being highly abundant and diverse, soil and litter invertebrate fauna perform a wide range of functions in forest ecosystems, many of which are key in determining soil properties with consequent impacts on plant communities (Deckmyn *et al.*, 2020). One of their most fundamental roles is in facilitating decomposition, both by physical breakdown of dead plant material and the microbial mineralisation of litter, thereby converting relatively complex and recalcitrant compounds into simpler, more palatable organic forms, thereby stimulating the mineralisation of essential nutrients and their availability to the plants (Wardle, 1999; Griffiths *et al.*, 2021; Njoroge *et al.*, 2022). While microorganisms carry out much of the decomposition seen in forests, experimental exclusions of invertebrate fauna indicate that they account for around 31% of total litter decomposition, underlining their significant contribution (Zeng *et al.*, 2024; but see Kampichler & Bruckner, 2009). Soil fauna, particularly macrofauna such as termites and earthworms, also reshape the physical characteristics of soils by building networks of galleries and burrows that promote water infiltration, aeration, and root penetration (Bardgett & van der Putten, 2014; Nielsen, Wall & Six, 2015; Zeng *et al.*, 2024). The ecological functions performed by soil fauna differ by region with macrofauna, such as termites and earthworms, dominating decomposition processes in tropical forests, while in boreal and temperate forests soil microbes and mesofauna are more important (Zeng *et al.*, 2024).

However, the sparsity of research on how natural disturbances may affect the abundance and distribution of soil fauna in forests hampers our ability to project how ecosystem functions will change in the near future and how this may vary by context. This knowledge gap is particularly concerning given that forest soils serve as major carbon sinks (Georgiou *et al.*, 2022; Mo *et al.*, 2023), and because increases in disturbance frequency and severity can impact the functions performed by soil fauna that are essential for maintaining processes involved in preserving the health of forest ecosystems, such as the supply of water and nutrients or carbon sequestration. Improving our projections of how altered disturbance regimes will affect forest soil processes therefore requires a thorough understanding of the impacts on soil and litter fauna.

Despite the limited attention paid to the impacts of natural forest disturbances to soil and litter fauna, several meta-analyses have synthesised how they are impacted by fire (Pressler, Moore & Cotrufo, 2019; Viljur *et al.*, 2022), precipitation change (Peng *et al.*, 2022; Bristol *et al.*, 2023; Goncharov *et al.*, 2023; Martin *et al.*, 2024), and insect pests (Kristensen, Rousk & Metcalfe, 2020). While these studies provide valuable insights, few of them systematically assess which topics are well studied or poorly studied (hereafter knowledge clusters and knowledge gaps, respectively) or the biases that affect the literature (although see Martin *et al.*, 2024). The existing literature hints at three major topics relating to this: (i) *what* is studied - imbalances in the amount of research on different natural disturbances (Seidl *et al.*, 2017; Montagné-Huck & Brunette, 2018; Viljur *et al.*, 2022), and taxonomic or functional groups of soil and litter fauna (Pressler *et al.*, 2019; Martin *et al.*, 2024); (ii) *where* it is studied - an overrepresentation of studies from Europe and North America, with other regions lacking studies (Cameron *et al.*, 2018; Martin *et al.*, 2024); and (iii) *how* it is studied - a reliance on simple biodiversity metrics that limit our ability to project ecosystem functioning (Gongalsky *et al.*, 2021) and methodological weaknesses in study design (Christie *et al.*, 2019, 2020). Despite indications of these issues in the literature, to date, there has been no systematic attempt to quantify them.

To address these knowledge gaps, we used systematic mapping: an approach that aims to identify, collate, catalogue, and describe the evidence related to a particular topic (James, Randall & Haddaway, 2016). This methodology is similar to systematic review, but rather than attempting to answer questions relating to impacts of stressors or management, it instead aims to identify research clusters and gaps to guide future field-based and synthesis research (James *et al.*, 2016). Here we used this methodology to address three research objectives:

1. Identify geographical knowledge clusters and knowledge gaps related to the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna.
2. Identify biases in the taxonomic groups and biodiversity metrics investigated in the literature
3. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of methodologies used by primary studies of the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna.

Methods

Searches and screening

Our systematic map focused on primary studies that assess the impacts of natural disturbances on soil and litter invertebrate biodiversity in forest ecosystems in field settings. To guide the scope of the work we formally defined five PECOS elements: Population, Exposure, Comparison, Outcomes, Space (Table 1, Grames *et al.*, 2019a). Our study methods follow existing guidelines (Collaboration for Environmental Evidence, 2018; Haddaway *et al.*, 2018) and our preregistered protocol (Martin *et al.*, 2021). To ensure total transparency, we have highlighted any deviations from the protocol.

Table 1 - Different PECOS elements used to define the scope of the systematic map

PECOS element	Description
Population	Soil and litter fauna found in forest ecosystems. We defined these as invertebrates which spend a significant proportion of their life in litter and/or soil, excluding ants. Details of the selected taxonomic groups are in Table S2.
Exposure	Reductions in precipitation, increases in precipitation, insect pests, plant pathogens, fire, and windthrow.
Comparison	Any comparison between forests that vary in the frequency or intensity of a disturbance of interest that they are subject to. This comparison may be spatial or temporal.
Outcomes	Abundance, biomass, and diversity of soil and litter fauna, as well as interactions between different soil fauna.
Space	Studies carried out in the field. All types of terrestrial forest and woodland were included, including savannas.

The searches for this study were carried out on 25/11/2021. To identify search terms, we created an initial list, then used the R package litsearchr to suggest additional terms, and refined final search terms based on these suggestions (Grames, Stillman & Tingley, 2019b; see supplementary methods for more details). We aimed to balance search sensitivity (i.e. the retrieval of all relevant studies) and specificity (i.e. the retrieval of only relevant documents) by following the recommendations of Foo *et al.* (2021) and developing a benchmark list of articles deemed essential to be included in our searches (Collaboration for Environmental Evidence, 2018; Table S3). Once final search terms were identified, we performed platform-specific searches in Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, and Open Access Theses and Dissertations (see details in Table S4). When searching Google Scholar, we used the R package gsscraper (Haddaway, 2020) to download the first 1000 relevant references we found, which should encompass the majority of relevant studies (Haddaway *et al.*, 2015). Searching for unpublished grey literature as well as published, peer-reviewed literature, minimised the risks associated with publication bias (Konno & Pullin, 2020). In addition to formal searches, we contacted five expert researchers to help identify potentially relevant studies and included references from primary studies that met our inclusion criteria using the R package citationchaser (Haddaway, Grainger & Gray 2021).

Once searches were completed, we downloaded all references found as .bib or .ris files and used the R packages synthesisr to remove duplicate articles (Westgate & Grames, 2020) and bibfix (Haddaway *et al.*, 2021) to repair bibliographic files with incomplete data. Files were then uploaded to sysrev (Bozada *et al.*, 2021) - an online tool that allows for screening and data extraction by review teams (see Martin, 2021). Article titles and abstracts were screened for relevance, and articles that met inclusion criteria were retained and their full text reviewed (see details in Figure S1). To meet our eligibility criteria, which were based on the PECOS elements, studies needed to: (1) Relate to soil and litter fauna in forests; (2) Address the impact of changes in precipitation, fire, windthrow, insect pests, or plant pathogens; (3) Be field-based (i.e. not be carried out in greenhouses or mesocosms); (4) Quantitatively assess soil fauna biomass, abundance, diversity, or interactions between soil fauna; (5) Have a comparison between sites that vary in the intensity or frequency of the disturbance that they were exposed to; (6) Be written in English. At the title and abstract screening stage, we retained articles that met criteria 1-3 and criterion 5. At the full-text stage, criteria 1-6 needed to be met for an article to be retained. At the full-text screening stage, we provided reasons for the exclusion of all articles that did not meet our inclusion criteria in accordance with ROSES guidelines (Haddaway *et al.*, 2018; Figure S2). Despite being a multilingual team, we focussed only on English-language literature to simplify consistency checks between reviewers. We acknowledge that excluding literature written in non-English languages is a shortcoming that may lead to biases (Konno *et al.*, 2020; Amano *et al.*, 2021).

To ensure consistency, a random sample of 10% of titles and abstracts were screened by two team members (PM and LPI), using our inclusion criteria. Any disagreements between the two people were discussed, and eligibility criteria were revised where appropriate. Cohen's Kappa scores were calculated to test the agreement between the two people (Cohen, 1960). If Kappa scores were below 0.6, another 10% of titles and abstracts were screened by the same two team members with the process repeated until Kappa scores were >0.6. The same process was repeated for the full texts of publications that met inclusion criteria.

After screening of titles and abstracts, inter-reviewer agreement was 96.6% and the Kappa score was 0.84. For full text screening agreement was also 96.6% but the Kappa score was 0.92. We found 19,295 papers during searches, 1,020 of which were retained after screening of titles and abstracts, and 307 of which were used for data extraction (Figure S2). We did not perform formal critical appraisal of studies as this is considered an optional component of systematic mapping (James *et al.*, 2016), but we did collect information about study designs during data extraction.

Data extraction and coding

Our data extraction attempted to collate site-scale information from each publication. We considered sites to be separate when different experimental designs were used or when the different locations were separated by at least 10 km. Where information was not presented separately for different sites, we considered studies to represent a single site. We extracted contextual data to identify knowledge and gaps, biases, and methodological issues. To do this we extracted the following variables: geographic location, disturbance type, taxa of all soil and litter fauna recorded, the body size class of organisms studied (macrofauna, mesofauna, microfauna), the biodiversity outcomes recorded, whether studies were experimental or observational, the study design used, sampling methods, time after disturbance, and whether studies reported the intensity of disturbances. In a deviation from the preregistered protocol, we did not extract information on the season in which sampling was conducted or the scale at which measurements were made as these details were often missing from primary studies. Detailed descriptions of all the extracted variables are provided in Table S5. In a deviation from our protocol, we did not extract information on the season in which studies were conducted or whether studies supplied raw data on species abundance or diversity.

Analysis

Our analyses had two major aims: (i) the identification of themes that have been well-studied, those that have been studied rarely, and any biases present in the literature on the effects of forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna and (ii) an assessment of the study designs used in primary studies on the effects of forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna. Themes that have been well-studied, referred to as knowledge clusters, represent opportunities for in-depth synthesis such as systematic review and meta-analysis. Those that have been studied relatively rarely, referred to as knowledge gaps, represent potentially useful topics for future primary research (James *et al.*, 2016).

Our analyses of knowledge clusters, gaps, and biases concentrated on the geographic distribution of studies, the taxonomic and size class groups of fauna that were investigated, and the metrics of biodiversity that had been used. To identify regions that had been studied we produced maps of the distribution of study sites for each different disturbance. Following this we characterised the geographic biases associated with the study of each of the different disturbances. In order to do this, we assessed whether the distribution of studies differed from the distribution of the disturbances we were interested in, namely fire, precipitation changes, windthrow, and pests and pathogens. Since we were interested in forest disturbances and their potential impacts on soil and litter fauna, we aimed to identify locations where the intensity of forest disturbances has been great enough to cause tree mortality. We compiled global datasets on fire impacts (Tyukavina *et al.*, 2022), wind speeds (University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit & Harris, 2019), the Standardised Precipitation-Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) as an index of precipitation extremes (Beguería *et al.*, 2024), and datasets of insect damage for Western North America (Berner *et al.*, 2017) and Europe (Forzieri *et al.*, 2023). There were no global datasets of the distribution of insect damage in forests and we acknowledge the limitation of this element of the analysis. We discuss the implications of this further in the results and discussion section.

The datasets on fire impacts and insect damage already included information on tree mortality, so no further calculations were required. However, for the datasets of wind speed and precipitation extremes, we set a threshold of 12 metres per second for wind speed, considered intense enough to cause windthrow (Hale *et al.*, 2015; Chen *et al.*, 2018), and an SPEI value of <-2 or >2, which is considered to be extremely dry or wet (Pyarali *et al.*, 2022). For each dataset we then calculated the maximum intensity of disturbance for each pixel at a resolution of 0.5 degrees over the period 2001-2020. We chose this resolution to enhance comparability between the different disturbances because the datasets for SPEI and wind speed were only available at this resolution. Following this, we masked the datasets so that they represented the distribution of disturbances within forests that could potentially cause tree mortality. We plotted the distribution of each of the disturbances along with the distribution of corresponding study sites to highlight areas where disturbances had occurred but there were few studies. Similarly, we assessed how this related to the distribution of studies by calculating the area within each forest biome affected by each disturbance and then calculating the number of studies for each biome for each million km^2 of forest disturbed.

Aside from geographic biases we also assessed the taxonomic and size class groups of fauna that were investigated, and the metrics of biodiversity that had been used. We assessed which taxonomic groups had been studied for each of the different disturbances of interest by summing the number of sites at which each taxonomic group was studied for the different disturbances, which we summarised in the form of a heatmap. To assess whether there was a bias in the research attention each taxonomic group had received relative to their global abundance, we used estimates of global biomass for taken from Rosenburg *et al.* (2023), Potapov *et al.* (2023), van den Hoogen *et al.* (2019), and Bar-on *et al.* (2018) for springtails, mites, termites, millipedes, centipedes, earthworms, potworms, spiders, and scorpions. We then calculated the percentage of sites at which each taxonomic group was studied for each of the disturbances and subtracted the percentage of global biomass represented by the same group. This data was summarised in the form of a heatmap. Following this, we also assessed the number of taxonomic groups and body size classes that had been investigated at each site and produced histograms to show the distribution of this data. Finally, we assessed the different metrics of soil and litter fauna biodiversity that have been used to assess the impacts of the different disturbances.

To assess methods used in primary studies, we focused on the use of different study designs, the length of studies, the size of areas sampled in each study, and the depth to which samples were taken. These elements are key determinants of the robustness and scope of studies (Pressler *et al.*, 2019; Christie *et al.*, 2019, 2020). We classified study designs based on the definitions and assessment of methodological robustness provided by Christie *et al.* (2019; see Table 2). It should be noted that many of the different elements of study design are not mutually exclusive. To examine how study robustness varied by disturbance type, we produced plots of each combination of study design elements we found in primary studies, divided by disturbance type. To assess the potential for synthesis studies to examine the impacts of different disturbance intensities on soil and litter fauna we calculated the percentage of studies for each disturbance type that reported this information.

All analyses were carried out in R version 4.2.2 and we used the packages Tidyverse (Wickham *et al.*, 2019), terra (Hijmans, 2024), sf (Pebesma & Bivand, 2023), rgdal (Bivand, Keitt & Rowlingson, 2023), cowplot (Wilke, 2024), ggbeeswarm (Clarke, Sherrill-Mix &

Dawson, 2023), and lemon (Edwards, 2024). Fully reproducible code for all analyses can be found in the Zenodo repository associated with this article.

Table 2 - Classification of field study design elements used in this study based on Christie *et al.*(2019). The different study method elements can be combined, apart from the observational and experimental elements of the design, which represent fundamentally different types of study

Study method element	**Description**
Observational	A study in which no manipulation is made and where researchers take advantage of the occurrence of a disturbance (e.g. study assessing the impacts of a natural wildfire)
Experimental	A study in which the disturbance of interest is manipulated (e.g. exclusion of precipitation to simulate precipitation change)
After (A)	A study where change in biodiversity is assessed only after a disturbance
Before-After (BA)	A study where biodiversity is assessed both before and after a disturbance
Control-Impact (CI)	A study in which a comparison is made between an area in which a disturbance has occurred and an area where it has not
Randomised (R)	A study in which the manipulation of a disturbance is randomly distributed within a study area
Blocked	A study in which different treatments are applied in spatially contiguous areas (Blocks)

Results and discussion

Our systematic map summarises information from 307 primary studies of the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna (Figure S2), representing 387 study sites. Of the disturbances we considered, fire was studied much more (286 sites, 79%) than precipitation change (47 sites, 13%), windthrow (38 sites, 10%), and pests or pathogens (16 sites, 4%). Only 2 sites considered the impact of multiple disturbances. There were roughly equal numbers of study sites in broadleaf forests (Figure S3a, 177 sites, 45.7%) and needleleaf forests (175 sites, 45.2%), with few studies carried out in mixed forests (6 sites, 1.6%) and a number of sites where no details of forest type were given (29 sites, 7.5%). Most sites were located in naturally occurring forests (Figure S3b, 258 sites, 66.7%), with a relatively small number of studies carried out in plantations (26 sites, 6.7%), and a large number of studies where no detail was provided if forests were plantations or not (103 sites, 26.6%).

Knowledge clusters, knowledge gaps, and biases

Geographical knowledge clusters, gaps, and biases

Most study sites were found in Europe (161 sites) and North America (104 sites) with fewer sites in Oceania (43 sites), Asia (38), Africa (24) and South America (17) (Figure 1a, c, e, g). Temperate broadleaf forests were the most studied biomes (126 sites, 35.6% of all sites), Boreal (51 sites, 14.4%) and Mediterranean forests (42 sites, 13%). In contrast, Tropical coniferous forests and dry forests were barely studied at all with only three sites between them. Temperate broadleaf forest was the most studied biome for each individual disturbance with 81 sites for fire, 7 for pests and pathogens, 23 for precipitation change, and 15 for windthrow. This information clearly demonstrates there has been a greater research effort in biomes found in Europe and North America. However, in order to assess whether this distribution of sites represents a deviation from the actual distribution of the disturbances, further analyses were required.

To evaluate potential geographical biases, we quantified the number of study sites in each biome relative to the total area affected by disturbances. Overall, this indicated that boreal and tropical forests received less attention than would be expected given the area affected by different types of disturbance (Figure 1b, d, f, h). However, this pattern varied by disturbance. For fires, Mediterranean forests were by far the most well studied with 46.7 sites per million km^2 affected by fire (Figure 1b), followed by temperate savanna and shrubland (15.3 sites per million km^2) and temperate broadleaf forests (8.6 sites per million km^2). Meanwhile, fire in boreal forests and moist and dry tropical forests was understudied relative to the number of sites in other biomes with just 2.4, 1.4, and 0.6 sites per million km^2 affected by fire respectively (Figure 1b). This is particularly worrying for boreal and tropical moist forests, where large areas have been affected by fire (Figure 1a).

The lack of data on the distribution of perturbations caused by pests and pathogens to forests limited our analysis of bias to biomes found in Europe and western USA (Figure 1c). However, our results showed that temperate broadleaf forest was by far the most well studied biome (52.6 sites per million km^2 of forest disturbed), while there were relatively few studies in temperate savanna and shrubland, temperate coniferous forest, and no studies in Mediterranean forest.

In the case of precipitation change, Mediterranean forests were the most well studied relative to the area of forest disturbed (7.8 sites per million km^2 of forest disturbed), followed by temperate broadleaf forests (2.1 sites per million km^2), and temperate savannas (1.9 sites per million km^2) (Figure 1f). Meanwhile, there were very few studies in boreal forests (0.1 sites per million km^2) and no sites in tropical moist and dry forests or savannas (Figure 1f).

For windthrow, there were relatively few studies in total, but the most well studied biome relative to the area affected by this perturbation was temperate coniferous forest (14.3 sites per million km^2), followed by tropical moist forests (8.1 sites per million km^2) and temperate broadleaf forest (2.4 sites per million km^2) (Figure 1h). Meanwhile there were no studies in Mediterranean, boreal, tropical coniferous, and tropical dry forests or temperate or tropical savannas. The lack of studies in boreal forests is a particular concern, where we estimate that 2.3 million km^2 of forest - an area equivalent to the size of Greenland - are impacted by windthrow.

Our results reveal an imbalance in research effort on the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna, a substantial amount of work conducted in temperate, boreal, and Mediterranean forests. Tropical forest biomes meanwhile have received relatively little attention. When adjusting for the area affected by different disturbances, this pattern shifts slightly: while tropical forest biomes remain understudied, boreal forests also emerge as understudied due to the vast areas impacted by precipitation changes and fire.



Figure 1 - The geographic distribution of sites where impacts of natural disturbances on soil and litter fauna have been assessed for (a) fire, (c) pest or pathogens, (e) precipitation change, or (g) windthrow and the number of sites within different biomes relative to the area of forest disturbed for (b) fire, (d) pest or pathogens, (f) precipitation change, and (h) windthrow). For plots a, c, e, and g the grey area represents the forest area affected by disturbances at a resolution of 0.5 degrees that were sufficiently intense to cause tree mortality and point size represents the number of study sites within an area. Y axis labels in the right-hand panels are shown only for biomes where the corresponding disturbance was detected. For panel (d), distribution data for pests and pathogen disturbances was only available for the western USA and Europe, hence the small number of biomes represented.

These geographic biases limit our ecological understanding in several key ways. First, it means that we lack evidence from some forest ecosystems where the biomass of some of the most abundant soil fauna groups is especially high - specifically, nematodes in boreal forests and earthworms in tropical moist forests (van den Hoogen *et al.*, 2019; Phillips *et al.*, 2019). Disturbances that alter the abundance of soil fauna in these ecosystems could have disproportionately large impacts on key processes such as soil water availability, nutrient cycling and carbon sequestration, but we are currently poorly equipped to quantify these risks and project resulting outcomes. Second, in regions in which ecosystems have historically experienced low rates of disturbance from fires and droughts, such as tropical moist forests (Feldpausch *et al.*, 2022) and boreal forests (Harrison *et al.*, 2021), soil and litter faunal communities may be more sensitive to these disturbances due to a lack of exposure as species evolved (Balmford, 1996). The increasing frequency of natural forest disturbances under climate change (Dale, Hughes & Hayes, 2016; Seidl *et al.*, 2020; Patacca *et al.*, 2023) raises serious concerns about the resilience of soil and litter fauna in these ecosystems and regions. Yet the biases identified in our study mean that empirical data on faunal responses remain scarce - particularly in the case of precipitation change. Third, the underrepresentation of tropical forests means that particular taxonomic groups, such as termites, which play a key role in nutrient cycling in these regions, are also likely to be underrepresented. These biases undermine our ability to generalise about the effects of disturbances. At the same time some disturbances, such as fire and precipitation change, result in inherently more complex changes in the litter and soil conditions and therefore may warrant more intensive research. Based on this, and our results, we suggest that increasing the number of studies on the impacts of fires and precipitation change in tropical and boreal forest would be disproportionately valuable for informing generalisation about disturbance impacts. However, we also acknowledge that it is inherently difficult to determine when there is enough research on a topic due to the tendency of ecologists to recommend that ‘more research is needed’ for practically any topic (Hilborn & Ludwig, 1993). In the case of soil and litter fauna, one way of examining the need for further research for given topics is to investigate the potential impacts of increasing knowledge in contexts where few studies currently exist, using approaches such as Value of Information (Bolam *et al.*, 2019) or cumulative meta-analyses (Grainger *et al.*, 2020). These could then act as tools to provide guidance on where future research should be targeted.

Biases in taxonomic groups and biodiversity metrics

Some soil and litter taxa were clearly studied more than others, but this varied by disturbance type (Figure 2). For example, beetles were studied at 39% of sites where fire, windthrow, or pests and pathogens had been investigated, but only studied at 14% of sites where precipitation change was investigated. Springtails and mites were also heavily studied, especially for precipitation change where they were both studied at 44% of sites. However, for other disturbances, springtails were more commonly studied than mites. Regarding microfauna, the most frequently investigated group was nematodes, although, relative to the number of sites where fire was studied, this group received relatively little attention. Focusing solely on fire, there were also a large number of sites at which spiders, termites, and earthworms were investigated. There were few sites that investigated disturbance impacts on pseudocentipedes, rotifers, or tardigrades (Figure 2). There were also few sites that examined the impacts of multiple disturbances. More broadly, for all disturbances, macro- and mesofauna were more commonly studied than microfauna.

Although our analyses showing the number of sites where different taxonomic groups have been studied was informative, it did not reveal whether there is a bias in which groups are studied. To assess this, we accounted for global estimates of biomass for a subset of taxonomic groups, showing that nematodes, earthworms, potworms, and termites are understudied (Figure 3). While nematodes were often neglected for all disturbances, this was particularly true for fire. Meanwhile groups such as mites and springtails were studied at a greater percentage of sites than represented by their global biomass, indicating a bias towards studying these groups, especially in studies of precipitation change (Figure 3). There were smaller positive biases towards studying centipedes, millipedes, spiders, and scorpions.



Figure 2 - Number of sites at which the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna have been assessed for different combinations of taxonomic groups and disturbances. Labels at bottom refer to different size classes of soil and litter fauna, while those at the top refer to more detailed taxonomic groups.



Figure 3 - Bias in study effort for different taxonomic groups, shown by the difference between the percentage of sites at which they were investigated for each disturbance type and the percentage of total global biomass that each group represents. The x axis is organised in order of descending body size.

Deciding what constitutes a good study organism is complex (Dietrich *et al.*, 2020). We think there are two broad strategies to do this. First, researchers could use an unbiased approach, aiming to sample all taxa equally. Second, researchers could use prior knowledge to maximise the research gain for a given amount of effort. We hypothesise that researchers have favoured the second strategy by prioritising the study of taxonomic groups based on two factors: the sensitivity of the group to disturbance and the ease of studying that group. For example, beetles are amongst the most studied group for most disturbances, especially fire. This is probably because extensive taxonomic knowledge means that beetles can be identified easily and because of the relative ease with which litter-dwelling beetles can be sampled, compared to the labour-intensive methods needed for sampling soil organisms. Ground beetles, in particular, are considered fire-sensitive and have been proposed as bioindicators for the wider impacts of fires (Gerlach, Samways & Pryke, 2013). Similarly, spiders and termites were heavily studied in sites where forest fires had occurred, likely for similar reasons as seen for beetles (Gerlach *et al.*, 2013). In contrast, beetles were used relatively infrequently in studies of precipitation change. This is probably because their high dispersal capacity means they can move easily between smaller experimental plots, such as those used in precipitation exclusion or addition experiments, diminishing the impacts of changes in precipitation (Martin *et al.*, 2024).

In contrast to beetles, springtails and mites have been studied more intensively in precipitation change experiments. This is likely because these groups are particularly sensitive to changes in soil moisture (Aupic-Samain *et al.*, 2021; Martin *et al.*, 2024) and have relatively low dispersal ability, making them good study organisms for this context. Our findings that mesofauna, as a whole, have been more intensively studied than microfauna is aligned with the previous findings of reviews on the impacts of natural disturbances on soil fauna (Pressler *et al.*, 2019; Martin *et al.*, 2024) suggesting that the relative ease of sampling and taxonomic identification drives this research focus. This could present a serious problem where some groups are rarely studied due to the logistical and technical difficulties associated with doing this, with the potential for the impacts on some sensitive, but rarely studied groups, to go undetected.

Our analyses of biases clearly show that nematodes, earthworms, and potworms are understudied relative to their global biomass. This presents an interesting contrast with earlier reviews on soil biodiversity, which found a much greater focus on nematodes and earthworms (Guerra *et al.*, 2020; Beaumelle *et al.*, 2021). This difference is, in part, likely to be due to the differences in the contexts of these reviews which did not focus on forest ecosystems, meaning that they included agricultural areas, where taxa such as earthworms and nematodes are commonly used as indicators of soil quality (Fründ, Graefe & Tischer, 2011; Demetrio *et al.*, 2020). Interestingly, springtails and mites have received much more research attention, relative to their global biomass, likely due to their high densities compared to earthworms (Potapov *et al.*, 2022) and their key role in decomposition processes in forests (Lu *et al.*, 2025). More generally, the knowledge gaps and biases we observed in the study of soil and litter fauna are likely to be impacted by a lack of taxonomic expertise for the understudied groups (particularly for microfauna) and by methodological approaches that favor targeted taxonomic groups without harmonised classifications frameworks, at the expense of comprehensive community assessments (Beaumelle *et al.*, 2021; Gongalsky, 2021; Potapov *et al.*, 2022; Hedde *et al.*, 2022).



Figure 4 - The number of sites for which (a) different numbers of taxonomic groups were studied and (b) different body size classes were studied

Finally, we identified a large knowledge gap regarding the potential vulnerability to climate change-associated disturbances across the spectrum of body sizes and functions of soil fauna communities. At the vast majority of sites, only a small number of taxonomic groups were sampled (Figure 4a, mean = 2.97, median = 1). Researchers only investigated more than five taxonomic groups at 16% of sites and more than 10 taxonomic groups at 7% of sites. This picture was mirrored when considering the number of body size classes (i.e. micro-, meso-, and macrofauna) that researchers sampled at different sites, which was typically low (Figure 4b, mean = 1.27, median = 1). Two or more size classes were sampled at 24% of sites and three size classes were investigated at only 3% of sites. This knowledge gap has serious implications for our ability to understand and project how soils respond to climate change, since the body size of organisms has been shown to be linked to the vulnerability of faunal communities to disturbances (Martin *et al.*, 2024; Pérez-Izquierdo *et al.*, 2025).



Figure 5 - The number of sites at which different outcome measures have been assessed for each of the different natural disturbance types considered by our study.

Studies mostly focussed on relatively simple biodiversity metrics such as abundance and alpha diversity (Figure 5). However, research on fire impacts examined a broader range of outcomes such as changes in community composition, evenness, and network interactions, compared to other disturbances (Figure 5). Studies on both precipitation change and windthrow assessed community composition at a moderate number of sites, whereas studies of the impacts of pests and pathogens or of multiple disturbances, rarely did so. Overall, disturbances that received more research attention tended to have a greater diversity of biodiversity outcomes investigated (Figure 5). This could be driven by the increased incentivisation of novelty in ecological research (Ottaviani *et al.*, 2023), meaning that once basic effects of disturbances have been shown researchers seek to find impacts on more complex biodiversity outcomes.

The tendency to favour simpler metrics is common in disturbance ecology (Marshall *et al.*, 2020; Davison, Rahbek & Morueta-Holme, 2021) and is largely due to the logistical difficulty and resource needs of measuring more complex variables such as species interactions (Morales-Castilla *et al.*, 2015; Harvey *et al.*, 2017; Moreno-Mateos *et al.*, 2020). These challenges are particularly pronounced in soil ecology, where the opaque nature of soil makes direct observation of feeding interactions difficult, unlike in aboveground ecosystems. However, methods such as gut content analysis and stable isotope analyses can be used to infer diet (Potapov *et al.*, 2020). Investigating the impacts of disturbances on soil and litter food webs is particularly important given their potential for assessing the stability of multiple ecosystem functions and services (de Vries *et al.*, 2013; Barnes *et al.*, 2018). However, in order to do this there is a need for more multi-taxon studies, which as we have shown, are sorely lacking. Similarly, there is a distinct lack of studies that assess the impacts of disturbances on organisms that differ in body size and together these knowledge gaps limit a more holistic view of the impacts of disturbances on soil and litter organisms.

Implications of knowledge clusters, gaps, and biases for future studies

Our knowledge on the impacts of natural disturbances on soil fauna has increased markedly over the past two decades. As our analysis shows we now possess quantitative estimates of impacts of disturbances for 31 different taxonomic groups, and, in the case of fire, have information from every major forest biome in the world. We have deep knowledge about the impacts of forest fires on groups like beetles, springtails, and mites. However, there are also a number of important gaps that future primary studies should aim to fill. First, given the widespread nature of precipitation extremes, there are relatively few studies of precipitation change on forest soil and litter fauna. Second, important groups like nematodes and earthworms are understudied in the context of forest disturbances. Third, we need more multi-taxa and multi-body size studies that will enable more meaningful metrics that can be linked to soil function be measured.

Focusing on the implications of our systematic map for evidence syntheses, the current study suggests that there is sufficient primary literature to allow for meta-analyses of the impacts of fire, precipitation change, and potentially windthrow on soil and litter fauna in forests. These meta-analyses should predominantly focus on meso- and macrofauna, due to the relative lack of information about microfauna, and could investigate biodiversity in the form of abundance, alpha diversity, evenness, and community composition. Since most study sites were found in North America and Europe, it may be difficult to generalise the effects of disturbance outside of these regions. As such, we urge any future quantitative synthesis on this topic to fully consider constraints on generality that may result from this, as well as other biases and to test how well studies can generalise about impacts (Spake *et al.*, 2022). To do this, we recommend that future meta-analyses examine the degree to which models can predict responses in relatively understudied regions using statistical methods such as cross-validation. Not only would this make meta-analyses much more transparent and informative, but it would highlight regions and taxa for which we need more research in order to produce more accurate generalisations about disturbance impacts.

Based on our findings, key priorities for future primary research include an increase in research on tropical forest biomes, particularly relating to the impacts of fire, precipitation change, and windthrow. Equally, there is a need for more research in boreal forest regions for most disturbances. For our analyses of pests and pathogens we constructed a spatial dataset that covered the western USA and Europe, but not the remainder of the globe - indicating the need for greater efforts to build large-scale datasets of pest and pathogen impacts in forests. In addition, the relative lack of studies on the impacts of pests and pathogens on forest soil fauna is concerning given the large impacts bark beetles are having in temperate forests (Patacca *et al.*, 2023). The lack of information on the impacts of multiple disturbances limits our ability to project how soil and litter fauna biodiversity, and related soil functions, will change in the future (Beaumelle *et al.*, 2021; Peng *et al.*, 2022). Of particular concern is the potential for a disturbance of one type (e.g. drought) making soil and litter fauna more vulnerable to a subsequent, different, disturbance (e.g. fire) by filtering out some species with unfavourable traits, thereby reducing the diversity of potential responses to subsequent disturbances (Gladstone-Gallagher *et al.*, 2019). This is particularly important because different disturbances do not happen in isolation (Bowler *et al.*, 2020) and combined stressors can produce unexpected responses in soil biodiversity and function (Rillig *et al.*, 2019). One potential way for future studies to incorporate multiple drivers of global change is using sites where a disturbance has already been studied and use manipulative experiments to introduce other disturbances to allow fully factorial experiments to be conducted (Beaumelle *et al.*, 2021). Similarly, future primary studies should aim to integrate more taxonomic groups and differently sized organisms than most of those carried out to date, since the effects of the same disturbance on these groups can vary greatly (Martin *et al.*, 2024; Pérez-Izquierdo *et al.*, 2025).

Characteristics and robustness of study methods

In most sites observational methodologies were used (277, 69%) as opposed to experimental methods (126 sites, 31%) (Figure 6). For most disturbances, study designs were dominated by observational control-impact studies (also known as space-for-time substitution studies, Figure 6) which have relatively low robustness (De Palma *et al.*, 2018; Christie *et al.*, 2019). For studies of fire, windthrow, and pests and pathogens, a majority of sites (64%, 80%, and 73% respectively) were studied using observational control-impact designs. However, only 2% of sites where precipitation change was investigated used this methodology. Precipitation change studies tended to use more robust experimental methodologies (Figure 6), including blocked, randomised control-impact designs (12 sites, 22%) and randomised control-impact designs (8 sites, 15%). Before-after-control impact (BACI) studies were rare, with these methods used in 30 sites (11%) where fire impacts were studied and 3 sites (5%) where precipitation change was studied. No studies on pest and pathogen impacts or windthrow used BACI methods.

Studies tended to be relatively short, with a median difference between first and last sampling time of 7.9 months. This varied between disturbances, with precipitation change (median = 1.9 months), and fire (7.8 months) having the shortest study lengths (Figure 7a). Studies on windthrow (15.4 months) and pests and pathogens (19.4 months) tended to be longer (Figure 7a). The median plot size used for studies was 400 m^2, although this was higher for studies of fire (800 m^2), and lower for studies of precipitation change (150 m^2), windthrow (100 m^2), and pests and pathogens (250 m^2) (Figure 7b). The median depth to which samples were taken was 10 cm and this was very consistent across all disturbance types (Figure 7c). Finally, the intensity of disturbance was rarely reported with only 27% of sites reporting fire intensity, 6% of sites reporting intensity of pest or pathogen disturbances, and 0% of sites of windthrow reporting intensity (Figure 7d). Studies of precipitation change on the other hand, reported the intensity of these disturbances 73% of the time (Figure 7d).

The current study clearly demonstrates a bias towards observational studies and space-for-time substitution (also known as observation control-impact), especially for primary studies of the impacts of fire, windthrow, and pests and pathogens. This method represents the quickest and usually cheapest method for comparing biodiversity under different conditions by comparing sites that differ in their exposure to a disturbance, but are otherwise similar to each other (De Palma *et al.*, 2018). While such designs can produce high precision estimates of biodiversity change, they are not necessarily accurate because differences in sites other than exposure to disturbance (e.g. soil type or slope) often occur because disturbance occurrence is non-random in space (De Palma *et al.*, 2018). This typically means that control-impact designs incorrectly attribute biodiversity changes only to disturbance and that these estimates are less accurate than those provided by more complex study designs (Christie *et al.*, 2019, 2020). On the other hand, studies on precipitation impacts were, in general, likely to be considerably more robust than studies on other disturbances. Precipitation change studies were almost exclusively experimental in nature which have a much greater ability to determine causality than observational studies (De Palma *et al.*, 2018; Christie *et al.*, 2019). In addition, the use of study design elements such as blocking, where different treatments (e.g. control and precipitation reduction) are replicated in blocks to ensure that comparisons are valid, and randomisation were much more common for studies of precipitation change than for other disturbances.



Figure 6 - Prevalence of different study designs for sites included in the systematic map. Design names follow Christie *et al.* (2019, 2020): A - After; BA - Before-and-after; CI - Control-Impact; BACI - Before-after-control-impact; Blocked - studies where blocking was used to reduce variation between locations where different treatments were used; R - randomised. Study designs are organised on the y-axis based on their ability to accurately infer the impacts of disturbances on soil and litter fauna and are based on Christie *et al.* (2019, 2020) as well as Frampton *et al.* (2022). Note the differences in scale on the x axes.

Although experimental studies can allow for highly accurate assessments of the impacts of forest disturbances, space-for-time studies offer a number of advantages. One of these is that they investigate disturbances that have actually occurred in the real world, rather than simulated disturbances, such as when rainfall is restricted in a precipitation change experiment. This means that the intensity of the disturbance is more representative of real-world conditions than those where experimental manipulations have been carried out (Korell *et al.*, 2020; Martin *et al.*, 2024). In addition, the use of space-for-time approaches allow for chronosequences to be used, where differently aged forest patches are measured to infer long-term dynamics, which is logistically impossible to do using experimental methods (Walker *et al.*, 2010).



Figure 7 - Details of methods and reporting by studies for each different disturbance: (a) Study length and (b) plot area for each natural disturbance, (c) the sampling depth at each study site, and (d) the frequency with which the intensity of disturbance was reported for sites for each different disturbance type. The violin plots in (a) and (b) show the distribution of values for each disturbance, with horizontal lines representing the median for each disturbance type. Each point represents a value from an individual primary study. In (c) the vertical dashed line represents the overall median depth to which samples were taken.

Given the pros and cons of different study designs, we argue that researchers should aim to increase the number of studies using designs that are underrepresented for each disturbance type. In the cases of fire, pest and pathogens, and windthrow we encourage, where possible, more experimental work to allow causality to be more clearly characterised. In the case of precipitation change, we recommend the establishment of long-term monitoring programs of soil and litter fauna which could be used to examine the effect of droughts or large precipitation events in a more realistic manner. Such varied methods would allow for testing of the impacts of different methodologies on observed results (França *et al.*, 2016).

We found that most studies were relatively short term, typically lasting for less than 3 years, although there were some studies on fire impacts that were more long-term. Consequently, we lack a good understanding of the long-term impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna, such as the recovery of populations and communities (Malmström, 2010). This is concerning, because the little information we have suggests that recovery of soil organisms after fire is very limited (Pressler *et al.*, 2019). This reflects a common issue in ecology: the logistical challenges of long-term research, short-term funding, and the pressure for quick results. Additionally, most studies did not report the intensity of disturbance that soil fauna were exposed to, although many studies of precipitation change did report this - likely because changes in precipitation are easy to quantify and studies of precipitation were often controlled experiments. This lack of data on disturbance intensity, beyond precipitation change, hinders our ability to produce more nuanced projections of disturbance impact (Malmström, 2010; Zaitsev *et al.*, 2016; Pressler *et al.*, 2019). While the availability of this information for studies of precipitation change has allowed for more nuanced analyses of how impact varies as the magnitude of precipitation change is altered (Goncharov *et al.*, 2023; Martin *et al.*, 2024) similar analysis for fire, windthrow, and insect pests and pathogens are unlikely to be possible. As such, we urge primary researchers to work towards producing standardised indicators of disturbance severity and where appropriate to use these in their primary studies. In the case of researchers working on syntheses we recommend they contact primary authors directly to gain more details about disturbance severity where needed.

Future directions for primary studies and evidence synthesis

We set out our summarised recommendations for primary studies on the impacts of natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna in Table 3, acknowledging that knowledge gaps differ across perturbations. Regarding ideal location of studies, there is a clear need for more work in boreal and tropical biomes, which are understudied given the extent of these regions impacted by natural disturbances. Regarding which taxonomic groups should be studied more frequently, we recommend more work on earthworms, nematodes, and termites given their global importance for soil functioning and the relative lack of data we have for each group. However, more generally, primary studies would be much more valuable if they quantified a wider range of taxonomic groups and size classes - thereby allowing for a more nuanced interpretation of changes as a result of disturbances. A good example of this is Gongalsky *et al.* (2021) in which the forest fire impacts on soil micro-, meso-, and macrofauna were studied, along with microorganisms, allowing for estimation of carbon flows between different trophic groups. For most disturbances we encourage researchers to use more network based-approaches to assess potential trophic interactions between different groups, but recognise that because of the paucity of data we currently have for studies on pests and pathogens and multiple disturbances information on abundances and diversity would be valuable.

There is no single, perfect study design that would capture all of the nuances needed to characterise the impacts of different forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna. Rather, what we need is more variety of approaches to allow for comparison between them. In the case of disturbances like fire, windthrow, and pests and pathogens this implies, where possible, an increase in experimental studies that use realistic simulations of disturbances. However, in the case of precipitation changes, increased use of long-term monitoring would be preferable since there is already a strong experimental evidence base and an overreliance on experimental studies may come at the cost of realistic treatments and thus results. Ideally we also recommend that studies should monitor post-disturbance changes in biodiversity over longer time-scales in order to allow recovery patterns to be assessed. Finally, we also recommend that, where possible, authors of primary studies report the severity or intensity of disturbances to allow for impacts to be contextualised in a more nuanced fashion.

Table 3 - Summary of our recommendations for future primary studies of natural forest disturbance impacts on soil and litter fauna.

Disturbance type	**Priority biomes**	**Priority taxa**	**Priority metrics**	**Priority study designs**
Fire	Tropical and boreal forests	Earthworms, nematodes, multi-taxa studies	Networks	Experimental designs
Precipitation change	Tropical and boreal forests	Earthworms, nematodes, termites, multi-taxa studies	Networks	Observational designs
Pests and Pathogens	Unclear due to lack of data on disturbance distribution	Earthworms, nematodes, termites, multi-taxa studies	Networks	Experimental designs
Windthrow	Boreal, Mediterranean and tropical	Earthworms, nematodes, termites, multi-taxa studies	Abundance and alpha diversity	Experimental designs
Multiple	All biomes	All taxa	Abundance and alpha diversity	Any design

Our findings have important implications for evidence syntheses on the impacts of forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna. We start from the assumption that most meta-analyses will be global in nature and attempt to quantify mean effects of disturbances for a set of biodiversity outcomes, for a wide range of taxonomic groups, and explore heterogeneity in the observed impacts of disturbances. For most disturbance types - particularly fire, precipitation change, and windthrow - the available literature is now sufficient to support meaningful quantitative synthesis. However, taxonomic and geographic biases in the evidence base constrain what can be reliably inferred. Most studies focus on meso- and macrofauna and report relatively simple biodiversity metrics such as abundance, alpha diversity, or evenness, limiting the scope of synthesis. In addition, the strong overrepresentation of studies from Europe and North America means that global-scale meta-analyses risk over-generalising results that may not hold in tropical or boreal contexts and so we urge authors of future syntheses to explicitly examine the predictive ability of their models (Spake *et al.*, 2022). For fire impacts, there are likely a sufficient number of studies that use chronosequences to allow for examination of post-disturbance recovery trajectories, but for other disturbances, meta-analyses will be largely restricted to short-term effects. Finally, a recurring limitation is the absence of key contextual information - especially disturbance intensity and severity - which impedes analyses of response heterogeneity. Thus, while meta-analysis of the impacts of several natural forest disturbances on soil and litter fauna is possible, its reliability hinges on carefully accounting for the biases and gaps revealed in this map.

Study limitations

Our study represents one of the very few systematic maps relating to soil ecology (Envall *et al.*, 2023; Ouédraogo *et al.*, 2024) and by following best-practice guidelines (James *et al.*, 2016; Collaboration for Environmental Evidence, 2018) and by the publication of an a priori protocol (Martin *et al.*, 2021) we have ensured that it is methodologically highly robust.

However, there are still a number of limitations that, if addressed, would have increased the robustness of our work further. The most important limitation of our systematic map is that only studies that were written in English were considered for inclusion. Although this practice is common (Hannah *et al.*, 2024), excluding literature written in non-English languages may lead to biases (Konno *et al.*, 2020; Amano *et al.*, 2021). In the case of our study, the lack of consideration of major languages such as Chinese, Spanish, and Portuguese (Amano, González-Varo & Sutherland, 2016) is likely to have further reduced the number of relevant studies we found from tropical biomes. Methods to overcome this barrier include the use of review teams with increased linguistic diversity and the prudent use of automated translation to help screening and data extraction (Hannah *et al.*, 2024).

Conclusions

1. Forest fire impacts on soil and litter fauna are more frequently studied than those of precipitation change, windthrow, pests and pathogens, and multiple combined disturbances.
2. Taking into account the area impacted by the different disturbances, boreal and tropical forest biomes were typically understudied, while Mediterranean and temperate forests were better studied.
3. Taxonomic groups such as nematodes, earthworms, potworms, and termites were understudied relative to their global biomass, while groups like mites and springtails were well studied.
4. Most primary studies only investigated impacts on a small number of soil and litter taxa and used simple metrics such as abundance, alpha diversity, and evenness to assess impact.
5. Most studies used observational study designs, apart from studies of precipitation change where experimental studies were more common. Studies were also typically relatively short-term.

Funding statement: Philip Martin, Leticia Pérez-Izquierdo, Charlotte Biryol, Bertrand Guenet, Sebastiaan Luyssaert, Stefano Manzoni, Claire Menival, Ion Catalin Petritan, Mathieu Santonja and Jorge Curiel Yuste were funded by the grant Holistic management practices, modelling and monitoring for European forest soils—HoliSoils (EU Horizon 2020 grant agreement no. 101000289). PM was also funded by an Ikerbasque Fellowship. JCY was also funded by the coordinated project ATLANTIS (PID2020-113244GB- C21), the Basque Government through the BERC 2022-2025 programme, and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through the BC3 María de Maeztu excellence accreditation (MDM-2017- 0714).

References

AMANO, T., BERDEJO-ESPINOLA, V., CHRISTIE, A.P., WILLOTT, K., AKASAKA, M., BÁLDI, A., BERTHINUSSEN, A., BERTOLINO, S., BLADON, A.J., CHEN, M., CHOI, C.-Y., BOU DAGHER KHARRAT, M., DE OLIVEIRA, L.G., FARHAT, P., GOLIVETS, M., et al. (2021) Tapping into non-English-language science for the conservation of global biodiversity. *PLoS biology* **19**, e3001296.

AMANO, T., GONZÁLEZ-VARO, J.P. & SUTHERLAND, W.J. (2016) Languages Are Still a Major Barrier to Global Science. *PLoS biology* **14**, e2000933.

ANTHONY, M.A., BENDER, S.F. & VAN DER HEIJDEN, M.G.A. (2023) Enumerating soil biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **120**, e2304663120.

AUPIC-SAMAIN, A., BALDY, V., DELCOURT, N., KROGH, P.H., GAUQUELIN, T., FERNANDEZ, C. & SANTONJA, M. (2021) Water availability rather than temperature control soil fauna community structure and prey–predator interactions. *Functional ecology* **35**, 1550–1559. Wiley.

BALMFORD, A. (1996) Extinction filters and current resilience: the significance of past selection pressures for conservation biology. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **11**, 193–196.

BARDGETT, R.D. & VAN DER PUTTEN, W.H. (2014) Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Nature* **515**, 505–511.

BARLOW, J., BERENGUER, E., CARMENTA, R. & FRANÇA, F. (2020) Clarifying Amazonia's burning crisis. *Global change biology* **26**, 319–321.

BARNES, A.D., JOCHUM, M., LEFCHECK, J.S., EISENHAUER, N., SCHERBER, C., O'CONNOR, M.I., DE RUITER, P. & BROSE, U. (2018) Energy Flux: The Link between Multitrophic Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **33**, 186–197.

BAR-ON, Y.M., PHILLIPS, R. & MILO, R. (2018) The biomass distribution on Earth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **115**, 6506–6511.

BEAUMELLE, L., THOUVENOT, L., HINES, J., JOCHUM, M., EISENHAUER, N. & PHILLIPS, H.R.P. (2021) Soil fauna diversity and chemical stressors: a review of knowledge gaps and roadmap for future research. *Ecography* **44**, 845–859. Wiley.

BEGUERÍA, S., VICENTE SERRANO, S.M., REIG-GRACIA, F. & LATORRE GARCÉS, B. (2024) SPEIbase v.2.10. *Digital.CSIC*. http://dx.doi.org/10.20350/DIGITALCSIC/16497 [accessed 2024].

BERNER, L.T., LAW, B.E., MEDDENS, A.J.H. & HICKE, J.A. (2017) Tree mortality from fires, bark beetles, and timber harvest during a hot and dry decade in the western United States (2003–2012). *Environmental research letters* **12**, 065005. IOP Publishing.

BIVAND, R., KEITT, T. & ROWLINGSON, B. (2023) rgdal: Bindings for the `Geospatial' Data Abstraction Library.

BOLAM, F.C., GRAINGER, M.J., MENGERSEN, K.L., STEWART, G.B., SUTHERLAND, W.J., RUNGE, M.C. & MCGOWAN, P.J.K. (2019) Using the Value of Information to improve conservation decision making: Value of Information for conservation decisions. *Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **94**, 629–647. Wiley.

BOWLER, D.E., BJORKMAN, A.D., DORNELAS, M., MYERS-SMITH, I.H., NAVARRO, L.M., NIAMIR, A., SUPP, S.R., WALDOCK, C., WINTER, M., VELLEND, M., BLOWES, S.A., BÖHNING-GAESE, K., BRUELHEIDE, H., ELAHI, R., ANTÃO, L.H., et al. (2020) Mapping human pressures on biodiversity across the planet uncovers anthropogenic threat complexes. *People and nature (Hoboken, N.J.)* **2**, 380–394. Wiley.

BOZADA, T., BORDEN, J., WORKMAN, J., DEL CID, M., MALINOWSKI, J. & LUECHTEFELD, T. (2021) Sysrev: A FAIR platform for Data Curation and Systematic Evidence Review. *bioRxiv*. https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.24.436697v1.abstract [accessed 24 September 2021].

BRISTOL, D., HASSAN, K., BLANKINSHIP, J.C. & NIELSEN, U.N. (2023) Responses of nematode abundances to increased and reduced rainfall under field conditions: A meta-analysis. *Ecosphere* **14**. Wiley.

CAMERON, E.K., MARTINS, I.S., LAVELLE, P., MATHIEU, J., TEDERSOO, L., GOTTSCHALL, F., GUERRA, C.A., HINES, J., PATOINE, G., SIEBERT, J., WINTER, M., CESARZ, S., DELGADO-BAQUERIZO, M., FERLIAN, O., FIERER, N., et al. (2018) Global gaps in soil biodiversity data. *Nature ecology & evolution* **2**, 1042–1043.

CHEN, Y.-Y., GARDINER, B., PASZTOR, F., BLENNOW, K., RYDER, J., VALADE, A., NAUDTS, K., OTTO, J., MCGRATH, M.J., PLANQUE, C. & LUYSSAERT, S. (2018) Simulating damage for wind storms in the land surface model ORCHIDEE-CAN (revision 4262). *Geoscientific model development* **11**, 771–791. Copernicus GmbH.

CHRISTIE, A.P., ABECASIS, D., ADJEROUD, M., ALONSO, J.C., AMANO, T., ANTON, A., BALDIGO, B.P., BARRIENTOS, R., BICKNELL, J.E., BUHL, D.A. & OTHERS (2020) Quantifying and addressing the prevalence and bias of study designs in the environmental and social sciences. *Nature communications*. Nature.

CHRISTIE, A.P., AMANO, T., MARTIN, P.A., SHACKELFORD, G.E., SIMMONS, B.I. & SUTHERLAND, W.J. (2019) Simple study designs in ecology produce inaccurate estimates of biodiversity responses. *The Journal of applied ecology* **56**, 2742–2754. Wiley Online Library.

CLARK, J.S., IVERSON, L., WOODALL, C.W., ALLEN, C.D., BELL, D.M., BRAGG, D.C., D'AMATO, A.W., DAVIS, F.W., HERSH, M.H., IBANEZ, I., JACKSON, S.T., MATTHEWS, S., PEDERSON, N., PETERS, M., SCHWARTZ, M.W., et al. (2016) The impacts of increasing drought on forest dynamics, structure, and biodiversity in the United States. *Global change biology* **22**, 2329–2352.

CLARKE, E., SHERRILL-MIX, S. & DAWSON, C. (2023) ggbeeswarm: Categorical Scatter (Violin Point) Plots.

COHEN, J. (1960) A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. *Educational and psychological measurement* **20**, 37–46. SAGE Publications Inc.

COLLABORATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE (2018) *Guidelines and Standards for Evidence synthesis in Environmental Management. Version 5.0*. www.environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors. [Accessed 6/10/21].

DALE, V.H., HUGHES, M.J. & HAYES, D.J. (2016) Climate change and the future of natural disturbances in the central hardwood region. In *Natural Disturbances and Historic Range of Variation* pp. 355–369. Springer International Publishing, Cham.

DAVISON, C.W., RAHBEK, C. & MORUETA-HOLME, N. (2021) Land-use change and biodiversity: Challenges for assembling evidence on the greatest threat to nature. *Global change biology* **27**, 5414–5429.

DE PALMA, A., SANCHEZ-ORTIZ, K., MARTIN, P.A., CHADWICK, A., GILBERT, G., BATES, A.E., BÖRGER, L., CONTU, S., HILL, S.L.L. & PURVIS, A. (2018) Chapter Four - Challenges With Inferring How Land-Use Affects Terrestrial Biodiversity: Study Design, Time, Space and Synthesis. In *Advances in Ecological Research* (eds D.A. BOHAN, A.J. DUMBRELL, G. WOODWARD & M. JACKSON), pp. 163–199. Academic Press.

DECKMYN, G., FLORES, O., MAYER, M., DOMENE, X., SCHNEPF, A., KUKA, K., VAN LOOY, K., RASSE, D.P., BRIONES, M.J.I., BAROT, S., BERG, M., VANGUELOVA, E., OSTONEN, I., VEREECKEN, H., SUZ, L.M., et al. (2020) KEYLINK: towards a more integrative soil representation for inclusion in ecosystem scale models. I. review and model concept. *PeerJ* **8**, e9750.

DEMETRIO, W.C., RIBEIRO, R.H., NADOLNY, H., BARTZ, M.L.C. & BROWN, G.G. (2020)

Earthworms in Brazilian no-tillage agriculture: Current status and future challenges. *European journal of soil science* **71**, 988–1005. Wiley.

DIETRICH, M.R., ANKENY, R.A., CROWE, N., GREEN, S. & LEONELLI, S. (2020) How to choose your research organism. *Studies in history and philosophy of biological and biomedical sciences* **80**, 101227. Elsevier BV.

EDWARDS, S.M. (2024) lemon: Freshing Up your "ggplot2" Plots. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lemon.

ENVALL, I., FAGERLUND, F., JOHANSSON WESTHOLM, L., BRING, A., LAND, M., ÅBERG, C., HADDAWAY, N.R. & GUSTAFSSON, J.P. (2023) Existing evidence related to soil retention of phosphorus from on-site wastewater treatment systems in boreal and temperate climate zones: a systematic map. *Environmental Evidence* **12**, 1–29. BioMed Central.

FELDPAUSCH, T.R., CARVALHO, L., MACARIO, K.D., ASCOUGH, P.L., FLORES, C.F., CORONADO, E.N.H., KALAMANDEEN, M., PHILLIPS, O.L. & RICHARD A. STAFF (2022) Forest fire history in Amazonia inferred from intensive soil charcoal sampling and radiocarbon dating. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change* **5**, 815438. Frontiers Media SA.

FELDPAUSCH, T.R., PHILLIPS, O.L., BRIENEN, R.J.W., GLOOR, E., LLOYD, J., LOPEZ-GONZALEZ, G., MONTEAGUDO-MENDOZA, A., MALHI, Y., ALARCÓN, A., ÁLVAREZ DÁVILA, E., ALVAREZ-LOAYZA, P., ANDRADE, A., ARAGAO, L.E.O.C., ARROYO, L., AYMARD C., G.A., et al. (2016) Amazon forest response to repeated droughts. *Global biogeochemical cycles* **30**, 964–982. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

FORZIERI, G., DUTRIEUX, L.P., ELIA, A., ECKHARDT, B., CAUDULLO, G., TABOADA, F.Á., ANDRIOLO, A., BĂLĂCENOIU, F., BASTOS, A., BUZATU, A., DORADO, F.C., DOBROVOLNÝ, L., DUDUMAN, M.-L., FERNANDEZ-CARRILLO, A., HERNÁNDEZ-CLEMENTE, R., et al. (2023) The database of European Forest Insect and Disease Disturbances: DEFID2. *Global change biology* **29**, 6040–6065. Wiley.

FRAMPTON, G., WHALEY, P., BENNETT, M., BILOTTA, G., DORNE, J.-L.C.M., EALES, J., JAMES, K., KOHL, C., LAND, M., LIVOREIL, B., MAKOWSKI, D., MUCHIRI, E., PETROKOFSKY, G., RANDALL, N. & SCHOFIELD, K. (2022) Principles and framework for assessing the risk of bias for studies included in comparative quantitative environmental systematic reviews. *Environmental Evidence* **11**, 1–23. BioMed Central.

FRANÇA, F., LOUZADA, J., KORASAKI, V., GRIFFITHS, H., SILVEIRA, J.M. & BARLOW, J. (2016) Do space-for-time assessments underestimate the impacts of logging on tropical biodiversity? An Amazonian case study using dung beetles. *The Journal of applied ecology* **53**, 1098–1105. Wiley Online Library.

FRÜND, H.-C., GRAEFE, U. & TISCHER, S. (2011) Earthworms as bioindicators of soil quality. In *Biology of Earthworms* pp. 261–278. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.

GEORGIOU, K., JACKSON, R.B., VINDUŠKOVÁ, O., ABRAMOFF, R.Z., AHLSTRÖM, A., FENG, W., HARDEN, J.W., PELLEGRINI, A.F.A., POLLEY, H.W., SOONG, J.L., RILEY, W.J. & TORN, M.S. (2022) Global stocks and capacity of mineral-associated soil organic carbon. *Nature communications* **13**, 3797.

GERLACH, J., SAMWAYS, M. & PRYKE, J. (2013) Terrestrial invertebrates as bioindicators: an overview of available taxonomic groups. *Journal of insect conservation* **17**, 831–850. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

GLADSTONE-GALLAGHER, R.V., PILDITCH, C.A., STEPHENSON, F. & THRUSH, S.F. (2019)

Linking traits across ecological scales determines functional resilience. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **34**, 1080–1091. Elsevier BV.

GONCHAROV, A.A., LEONOV, V.D., ROZANOVA, O.L., SEMENINA, E.E., TSURIKOV, S.M., UVAROV, A.V., ZUEV, A.G. & TIUNOV, A.V. (2023) A meta-analysis suggests climate change shifts structure of regional communities of soil invertebrates. *Soil biology & biochemistry* **181**, 109014.

GONGALSKY, K.B. (2021) Soil macrofauna: Study problems and perspectives. *Soil biology & biochemistry* **159**, 108281.

GONGALSKY, K.B., ZAITSEV, A.S., KOROBUSHKIN, D.I., SAIFUTDINOV, R.A., BUTENKO, K.O., DE VRIES, F.T., EKSCHMITT, K., DEGTYAREV, M.I., GORBUNOVA, A.Y., KOSTINA, N.V., RAKHLEEVA, A.A., SHAKHAB, S.V., YAZRIKOVA, T.E., WOLTERS, V. & BARDGETT, R.D. (2021) Forest fire induces short-term shifts in soil food webs with consequences for carbon cycling. *Ecology letters* **24**, 438–450.

GRAINGER, M.J., BOLAM, F.C., STEWART, G.B. & NILSEN, E.B. (2020) Evidence synthesis for tackling research waste. *Nature ecology & evolution* **4**, 495–497.

GRAMES, E.M., MONTGOMERY, G.A., HADDAWAY, N.R., DICKS, L.V., S., C., MATSON, T.A., NAKAGAWA, S., SAUNDERS, M.E., TINGLEY, M.W., WHITE, T.E., WOODCOCK, P. & WAGNER, D.L. (2019a) Trends in global insect abundance and biodiversity: A community-driven systematic map protocol. *OSF*.

GRAMES, E.M., STILLMAN, A.N. & TINGLEY, M.W. (2019b) An automated approach to identifying search terms for systematic reviews using keyword co-occurrence networks. *Methods in ecology and evolution / British Ecological Society*. Wiley Online Library.

GRIFFITHS, H.M., ASHTON, L.A., PARR, C.L. & EGGLETON, P. (2021) The impact of invertebrate decomposers on plants and soil. *The new phytologist* **231**, 2142–2149. Wiley.

GUERRA, C.A., HEINTZ-BUSCHART, A., SIKORSKI, J., CHATZINOTAS, A., GUERRERO-RAMÍREZ, N., CESARZ, S., BEAUMELLE, L., RILLIG, M.C., MAESTRE, F.T., DELGADO-BAQUERIZO, M., BUSCOT, F., OVERMANN, J., PATOINE, G., PHILLIPS, H.R.P., WINTER, M., et al. (2020) Blind spots in global soil biodiversity and ecosystem function research. *Nature communications* **11**, 3870.

HADDAWAY, N.R. (2020) *GSscraper: An R package and Shiny app for exporting search results from Google Scholar*.

HADDAWAY, N.R., COLLINS, A.M., COUGHLIN, D. & KIRK, S. (2015) The Role of Google Scholar in Evidence Reviews and Its Applicability to Grey Literature Searching. *PloS one* **10**, e0138237.

HADDAWAY, N.R., GRAINGER, M.J., JONES, M.L. & STUART, A. (2021) *bibfix: An R package and Shiny app for repairing and enriching bibliographic data*.

HADDAWAY, N.R., MACURA, B., WHALEY, P. & PULLIN, A.S. (2018) ROSES RepOrting standards for Systematic Evidence Syntheses: pro forma, flow-diagram and descriptive summary of the plan and conduct of environmental systematic reviews and systematic maps. *Environmental Evidence* **7**, 7.

HALE, S.E., GARDINER, B., PEACE, A., NICOLL, B., TAYLOR, P. & PIZZIRANI, S. (2015) Comparison and validation of three versions of a forest wind risk model. *Environmental modelling & software: with environment data news* **68**, 27–41. Elsevier BV.

HANNAH, K., HADDAWAY, N.R., FULLER, R.A. & AMANO, T. (2024) Language inclusion in ecological systematic reviews and maps: Barriers and perspectives. *Research synthesis methods* **15**, 466–482.

HARRISON, S.P., COLIN PRENTICE, I., BLOOMFIELD, K.J., DONG, N., FORKEL, M., FORREST, M., NINGTHOUJAM, R.K., PELLEGRINI, A., SHEN, Y., BAUDENA, M., CARDOSO, A.W., HUSS, J.C., JOSHI, J., OLIVERAS, I., PAUSAS, J.G., et al. (2021) Understanding and modelling wildfire regimes: an ecological perspective. *Environmental research letters: ERL [Web site]* **16**, 125008. IOP Publishing.

HARVEY, E., GOUNAND, I., WARD, C.L. & ALTERMATT, F. (2017) Bridging ecology and conservation: from ecological networks to ecosystem function. *The journal of applied ecology* **54**, 371–379. Wiley.

HEDDE, M., BLIGHT, O., BRIONES, M.J.I., BONFANTI, J., BRAUMAN, A., BRONDANI, M., CALDERÓN SANOU, I., CLAUSE, J., CONTI, E., CORTET, J., DECAËNS, T., ERKTAN, A., GÉRARD, S., GOULPEAU, A., IANNELLI, M., et al. (2022) A common framework for developing robust soil fauna classifications. *Geoderma* **426**, 116073. Elsevier BV.

HIJMANS, R.J. (2024) terra: Spatial Data Analysis. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=terra.

HILBORN, R. & LUDWIG, D. (1993) The limits of applied ecological research. *Ecological applications: a publication of the Ecological Society of America* **3**, 550–552. [Wiley, Ecological Society of America].

VAN DEN HOOGEN, J., GEISEN, S., ROUTH, D., FERRIS, H., TRAUNSPURGER, W., WARDLE, D.A., DE GOEDE, R.G.M., ADAMS, B.J., AHMAD, W., ANDRIUZZI, W.S., BARDGETT, R.D., BONKOWSKI, M., CAMPOS-HERRERA, R., CARES, J.E., CARUSO, T., et al. (2019) Soil nematode abundance and functional group composition at a global scale. *Nature* **572**, 194–198.

JACQUET, J.-S., ORAZIO, C. & JACTEL, H. (2012) Defoliation by processionary moth significantly reduces tree growth: a quantitative review. *Annals of forest science* **69**, 857–866.

JAMES, K.L., RANDALL, N.P. & HADDAWAY, N.R. (2016) A methodology for systematic mapping in environmental sciences. *Environmental Evidence* **5**, 1–13. BioMed Central.

JU, R.-T., ZHU, H.-Y., GAO, L., ZHOU, X.-H. & LI, B. (2015) Increases in both temperature means and extremes likely facilitate invasive herbivore outbreaks. *Scientific reports* **5**, 15715.

KONNO, K., AKASAKA, M., KOSHIDA, C., KATAYAMA, N., OSADA, N., SPAKE, R. & AMANO, T. (2020) Ignoring non-English-language studies may bias ecological meta-analyses. *Ecology and evolution* **10**, 6373–6384.

KONNO, K. & PULLIN, A.S. (2020) Assessing the risk of bias in choice of search sources for environmental meta-analyses. *Research Synthesis Methods*. Wiley Online Library.

KORELL, L., AUGE, H., CHASE, J.M., HARPOLE, S. & KNIGHT, T.M. (2020) We need more realistic climate change experiments for understanding ecosystems of the future. *Global change biology* **26**, 325–327.

KRISTENSEN, J.Å., ROUSK, J. & METCALFE, D.B. (2020) Below-ground responses to insect herbivory in ecosystems with woody plant canopies: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of ecology* **108**, 917–930. Wiley.

LAPOLA, D.M., PINHO, P., BARLOW, J., ARAGÃO, L.E.O.C., BERENGUER, E., CARMENTA, R., LIDDY, H.M., SEIXAS, H., SILVA, C.V.J., SILVA-JUNIOR, C.H.L., ALENCAR, A.A.C., ANDERSON, L.O., ARMENTERAS, D., BROVKIN, V., CALDERS, K., et al. (2023) The drivers and impacts of Amazon forest degradation. *Science* **379**, eabp8622.

LECINA-DIAZ, J., SENF, C., GRÜNIG, M. & SEIDL, R. (2024) Ecosystem services at risk from disturbance in Europe's forests. *Global change biology* **30**, e17242.

LU, J.-Z., WENGLEIN, R., BLUHM, C., STUCKENBERG, T., POTAPOV, A.M., AMMER, C. & SCHEU, S. (2025) Reduced predation and energy flux in soil food webs by introduced tree species: Bottom-up control of multitrophic biodiversity across size compartments. *Functional ecology* **39**, 64–76. Wiley.

MALMSTRÖM, A. (2010) The importance of measuring fire severity—Evidence from microarthropod studies. *Forest ecology and management* **260**, 62–70.

MARSHALL, E., WINTLE, B.A., SOUTHWELL, D. & KUJALA, H. (2020) What are we measuring? A review of metrics used to describe biodiversity in offsets exchanges. *Biological conservation* **241**, 108250.

MARTIN, P.A. (2021) Soil_fauna_systematic_map. https://sysrev.com/p/98916 [accessed 8 September 2023].

MARTIN, P.A., FISHER, L., PÉREZ-IZQUIERDO, L., BIRYOL, C., GUENET, B., LUYSSAERT, S., MANZONI, S., MENIVAL, C., SANTONJA, M., SPAKE, R., AXMACHER, J.C. & YUSTE, J.C. (2024) Meta-analysis reveals that the effects of precipitation change on soil and litter fauna in forests depend on body size. *Global change biology* **30**, e17305.

MARTIN, P.A., PEREZ IZQUIERDO, L., LUYSSAERT, S., GUENET, B., MANZONI, S., SPAKE, R., SANTONJA, M. & CURIEL YUSTE, J. (2021) Effects of natural disturbances on soil fauna in forests: a systematic map protocol. *OSF*. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/YQU4W.

MO, L., ZOHNER, C.M., REICH, P.B., LIANG, J., DE MIGUEL, S., NABUURS, G.-J., RENNER, S.S., VAN DEN HOOGEN, J., ARAZA, A., HEROLD, M., MIRZAGHOLI, L., MA, H., AVERILL, C., PHILLIPS, O.L., GAMARRA, J.G.P., et al. (2023) Integrated global assessment of the natural forest carbon potential. *Nature* **624**, 92–101.

MONTAGNÉ-HUCK, C. & BRUNETTE, M. (2018) Economic analysis of natural forest disturbances: A century of research. *Journal of Forest Economics* **32**, 42–71.

MORALES-CASTILLA, I., MATIAS, M.G., GRAVEL, D. & ARAÚJO, M.B. (2015) Inferring biotic interactions from proxies. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **30**, 347–356. Elsevier BV.

MORENO-MATEOS, D., ALBERDI, A., MORRIËN, E., VAN DER PUTTEN, W.H., RODRÍGUEZ-UÑA, A. & MONTOYA, D. (2020) The long-term restoration of ecosystem complexity. *Nature ecology & evolution*.

NIELSEN, U.N., WALL, D.H. & SIX, J. (2015) Soil Biodiversity and the Environment. *Annual review of environment and resources* **40**, 63–90. Annual Reviews.

NJOROGE, D.M., CHEN, S.-C., ZUO, J., DOSSA, G.G.O. & CORNELISSEN, J.H.C. (2022) Soil fauna accelerate litter mixture decomposition globally, especially in dry environments. *The Journal of ecology* **110**, 659–672. Wiley.

OTTAVIANI, G., MARTINEZ, A., PETIT BON, M. & MAMMOLA, S. (2023) On the quest for novelty in ecology. *bioRxiv*. https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.02.27.530333v3.abstract [accessed 27 February 2025].

OUÉDRAOGO, D.-Y., LAFITTE, A., SORDELLO, R., POZZI, F., MIKAJLO, I., ARAUJO, J.H.R., REYJOL, Y. & LERCH, T.Z. (2024) Existing evidence on the potential of soils constructed from mineral wastes to support biodiversity: a systematic map. *Environmental Evidence* **13**, 1–15. BioMed Central.

PATACCA, M., LINDNER, M., LUCAS-BORJA, M.E., CORDONNIER, T., FIDEJ, G., GARDINER, B., HAUF, Y., JASINEVIČIUS, G., LABONNE, S., LINKEVIČIUS, E., MAHNKEN, M., MILANOVIC, S., NABUURS, G.-J., NAGEL, T.A., NIKINMAA, L., et al. (2023) Significant increase in natural disturbance impacts on European forests since 1950. *Global change biology* **29**, 1359–1376.

PEBESMA, E. & BIVAND, R. (2023) *Spatial Data Science*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York.

PECHONY, O. & SHINDELL, D.T. (2010) Driving forces of global wildfires over the past millennium and the forthcoming century. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107**, 19167–19170.

PENG, Y., PEÑUELAS, J., VESTERDAL, L., YUE, K., PEGUERO, G., FORNARA, D.A., HEDĚNEC, P., STEFFENS, C. & WU, F. (2022) Responses of soil fauna communities to the individual and combined effects of multiple global change factors. *Ecology letters* **25**, 1961–1973.

PÉREZ-IZQUIERDO, L., MÉNIVAL, C., BALDRIAN, P., BALDY, V., BIRYOL, C., GROS, R., HEREŞ, A.-M., LE BAGOUSSE-PINGUET, Y., MARTINOVIC, T., PETRITAN, I.C., SÁNCHEZ-MORENO, S., SANTONJA, M. & CURIEL YUSTE, J. (2025) Impacts of canopy disturbances by tree logging on soil Biota increase with organism size. *Global change biology* **31**, e70287. Wiley.

PHILLIPS, H.R.P., CAMERON, E.K., FERLIAN, O., TÜRKE, M., WINTER, M. & EISENHAUER, N. (2017) Red list of a black box. *Nature ecology & evolution* **1**, 103.

PHILLIPS, H.R.P., GUERRA, C.A., BARTZ, M.L.C., BRIONES, M.J.I., BROWN, G., CROWTHER, T.W., FERLIAN, O., GONGALSKY, K.B., VAN DEN HOOGEN, J., KREBS, J., ORGIAZZI, A., ROUTH, D., SCHWARZ, B., BACH, E.M., BENNETT, J., et al. (2019) Global distribution of earthworm diversity. *Science* **366**, 480–485.

PILLAY, R., VENTER, M., ARAGON-OSEJO, J., GONZÁLEZ-DEL-PLIEGO, P., HANSEN, A.J., WATSON, J.E. & VENTER, O. (2022) Tropical forests are home to over half of the world's vertebrate species. *Frontiers in ecology and the environment* **20**, 10–15.

POTAPOV, A., BELLINI, B., CHOWN, S., DEHARVENG, L., JANSSENS, F., KOVÁČ, Ľ., KUZNETSOVA, N., PONGE, J.-F., POTAPOV, M., QUERNER, P., RUSSELL, D., SUN, X., ZHANG, F. & BERG, M. (2020) Towards a global synthesis of Collembola knowledge – challenges and potential solutions. *Soil organisms* **92**, 161–188.

POTAPOV, A.M., BEAULIEU, F., BIRKHOFER, K., BLUHM, S.L., DEGTYAREV, M.I., DEVETTER, M., GONCHAROV, A.A., GONGALSKY, K.B., KLARNER, B., KOROBUSHKIN, D.I., LIEBKE, D.F., MARAUN, M., MC DONNELL, R.J., POLLIERER, M.M., SCHAEFER, I., et al. (2022) Feeding habits and multifunctional classification of soil-associated consumers from protists to vertebrates. *Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Wiley.

POTAPOV, A.M., GUERRA, C.A., VAN DEN HOOGEN, J., BABENKO, A., BELLINI, B.C., BERG, M.P., CHOWN, S.L., DEHARVENG, L., KOVÁČ, Ľ., KUZNETSOVA, N.A., PONGE, J.-F., POTAPOV, M.B., RUSSELL, D.J., ALEXANDRE, D., ALATALO, J.M., et al. (2023) Globally invariant metabolism but density-diversity mismatch in springtails. *Nature communications* **14**, 674.

PRESSLER, Y., MOORE, J.C. & COTRUFO, M.F. (2019) Belowground community responses to fire: meta-analysis reveals contrasting responses of soil microorganisms and mesofauna. *Oikos* **128**, 309–327. Wiley.

PYARALI, K., PENG, J., DISSE, M. & TUO, Y. (2022) Development and application of high resolution SPEI drought dataset for Central Asia. *Scientific data* **9**, 172. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

RILLIG, M.C., RYO, M., LEHMANN, A., AGUILAR-TRIGUEROS, C.A., BUCHERT, S., WULF, A., IWASAKI, A., ROY, J. & YANG, G. (2019) The role of multiple global change factors in driving soil functions and microbial biodiversity. *Science* **366**, 886–890.

ROSENBERG, Y., BAR-ON, Y.M., FROMM, A., OSTIKAR, M., SHOSHANY, A., GIZ, O. & MILO, R. (2023) The global biomass and number of terrestrial arthropods. *Science advances* **9**, eabq4049. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

SEIDL, R., HONKANIEMI, J., AAKALA, T., ALEINIKOV, A., ANGELSTAM, P., BOUCHARD, M., BOULANGER, Y., BURTON, P.J., DE GRANDPRÉ, L., GAUTHIER, S., HANSEN, W.D., JEPSEN, J.U., JÕGISTE, K., KNEESHAW, D.D., KUULUVAINEN, T., et al. (2020) Globally consistent climate sensitivity of natural disturbances across boreal and temperate forest ecosystems. *Ecography* **43**, 967–978. Wiley.

SEIDL, R., SCHELHAAS, M.-J., RAMMER, W. & VERKERK, P.J. (2014) Increasing forest disturbances in Europe and their impact on carbon storage. *Nature climate change* **4**, 806–810.

SEIDL, R., THOM, D., KAUTZ, M., MARTIN-BENITO, D., PELTONIEMI, M., VACCHIANO, G., WILD, J., ASCOLI, D., PETR, M., HONKANIEMI, J., LEXER, M.J., TROTSIUK, V., MAIROTA, P., SVOBODA, M., FABRIKA, M., et al. (2017) Forest disturbances under climate change. *Nature climate change* **7**, 395–402.

SPAKE, R., O'DEA, R.E., NAKAGAWA, S., PATRICK DONCASTER, C., RYO, M., CALLAGHAN, T. & BULLOCK, J.M. (2022) Improving quantitative synthesis to achieve generality in ecology. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 1818–1828.

TYUKAVINA, A., POTAPOV, P., HANSEN, M.C., PICKENS, A.H., STEHMAN, S.V., TURUBANOVA, S., PARKER, D., ZALLES, V., LIMA, A., KOMMAREDDY, I., SONG, X.-P., WANG, L. & HARRIS, N. (2022) Global Trends of Forest Loss Due to Fire From 2001 to 2019. *Frontiers in Remote Sensing* **3**.

UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA CLIMATIC RESEARCH UNIT & HARRIS, I.C. (2019) CRU JRA: Collection of CRU JRA forcing datasets of gridded land surface blend of Climatic Research Unit (CRU) and Japanese reanalysis (JRA) data. *Centre for Environmental Data Analysis*. http://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/863a47a6d8414b6982e1396c69a9efe8/ [accessed 4 March 2025].

VILJUR, M.-L., ABELLA, S.R., ADÁMEK, M., ALENCAR, J.B.R., BARBER, N.A., BEUDERT, B., BURKLE, L.A., CAGNOLO, L., CAMPOS, B.R., CHAO, A., CHERGUI, B., CHOI, C.-Y., CLEARY, D.F.R., DAVIS, T.S., DECHNIK-VÁZQUEZ, Y.A., et al. (2022) The effect of natural disturbances on forest biodiversity: an ecological synthesis. *Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **97**, 1930–1947.

DE VRIES, F.T., THÉBAULT, E., LIIRI, M., BIRKHOFER, K., TSIAFOULI, M.A., BJØRNLUND, L., BRACHT JØRGENSEN, H., BRADY, M.V., CHRISTENSEN, S., DE RUITER, P.C., D'HERTEFELDT, T., FROUZ, J., HEDLUND, K., HEMERIK, L., HOL, W.H.G., et al. (2013) Soil food web properties explain ecosystem services across European land use systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **110**, 14296–14301.

WALKER, L.R., WARDLE, D.A., BARDGETT, R.D. & CLARKSON, B.D. (2010) The use of chronosequences in studies of ecological succession and soil development. *The Journal of ecology* **98**, 725–736. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

WARDLE, D.A. (1999) How soil food webs make plants grow. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **14**, 418–420. Elsevier BV.

WESTGATE, M. & GRAMES, E. (2020) synthesisr: Import, Assemble, and Deduplicate Bibliographic Datasets. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=synthesisr.

WICKHAM, H., AVERICK, M., BRYAN, J., CHANG, W., MCGOWAN, L.D., FRANÇOIS, R., GROLEMUND, G., HAYES, A., HENRY, L., HESTER, J., KUHN, M., PEDERSEN, T.L., MILLER, E., BACHE, S.M., MÜLLER, K., et al. (2019) Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*. http://dx.doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686.

WILKE, C.O. (2024) cowplot: Streamlined Plot Theme and Plot Annotations for “ggplot2.” https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cowplot.

ZAITSEV, A.S., GONGALSKY, K.B., MALMSTRÖM, A., PERSSON, T. & BENGTSSON, J. (2016) Why are forest fires generally neglected in soil fauna research? A mini-review. *Applied soil ecology: a section of Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **98**, 261–271.

ZENG, X., GAO, H., WANG, R., MAJCHER, B.M., WOON, J.S., WENDA, C., EGGLETON, P., GRIFFITHS, H.M. & ASHTON, L.A. (2024) Global contribution of invertebrates to forest litter decomposition. *Ecology letters* **27**, e14423. Wiley.

ZHOU, Z., WANG, C. & LUO, Y. (2020) Meta-analysis of the impacts of global change factors on soil microbial diversity and functionality. *Nature communications* **11**, 3072.