

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316654446>

Conventional tillage decreases the abundance and biomass of earthworms and alters their community structure in a global...

Article in *Global Change Biology* · October 2017

DOI: 10.1111/gcb.13744

CITATIONS

0

READS

259

2 authors:



Maria J I Briones

University of Vigo

98 PUBLICATIONS 2,056 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Olaf Schmidt

University College Dublin

149 PUBLICATIONS 2,568 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



EcoFINDERS: Ecological Function and Biodiversity Indicators in European Soils [View project](#)



Ecofinders: Ecological Function and Biodiversity Indicators in European Soils. Financed by European Comission. (Collaborative Project FP7). [View project](#)

Conventional tillage decreases the abundance and biomass of earthworms and alters their community structure in a global meta-analysis

María Jesús I. Briones^{1,2}  | Olaf Schmidt³ 

¹Departamento de Ecología y Biología Animal, Universidad de Vigo, Vigo, Spain

²Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Lancaster, Bailrigg, Lancaster, UK

³UCD School of Agriculture and Food Science, and UCD Earth Institute, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin, Ireland

Correspondence

María J. I. Briones, Departamento de Ecología y Biología Animal, Universidad de Vigo, Vigo, Spain.
Email: mbriones@uvigo.es

Abstract

The adoption of less intensive soil cultivation practices is expected to increase earthworm populations and their contributions to ecosystem functioning. However, conflicting results have been reported on the effects of tillage intensity on earthworm populations, attributed in narrative reviews to site-dependent differences in soil properties, climatic conditions and agronomic operations (e.g. fertilization, residue management and chemical crop protection). We present a quantitative review based on a global meta-analysis, using paired observations from 165 publications performed over 65 years (1950–2016) across 40 countries on five continents, to elucidate this long-standing unresolved issue. Results showed that disturbing the soil less (e.g. no-tillage and conservation agriculture [CA]) significantly increased earthworm abundance (mean increase of 137% and 127%, respectively) and biomass (196% and 101%, respectively) compared to when the soil is inverted by conventional ploughing. Earthworm population responses were more pronounced when the soil had been under reduced tillage (RT) for a long time (>10 years), in warm temperate zones with fine-textured soils, and in soils with higher clay contents (>35%) and low pH (<5.5). Furthermore, retaining organic harvest residues amplified this positive response to RT, whereas the use of the herbicide glyphosate did not significantly affect earthworm population responses to RT. Additional meta-analyses confirmed that epigeic and, more importantly, the bigger-sized anecic earthworms were the most sensitive ecological groups to conventional tillage. In particular, the deep burrower *Lumbricus terrestris* exhibited the strongest positive response to RT, increasing in abundance by 124% more than the overall mean of all 13 species analysed individually. The restoration of these two important ecological groups of earthworms and their burrowing, feeding and casting activities under various forms of RT will ensure the provision of ecosystem functions such as soil structure maintenance and nutrient cycling by “nature’s plough.”

KEYWORDS

agricultural management, community composition, ecological groupings, Oligochaeta, tillage systems

1 | INTRODUCTION

Land use and soil management are major drivers of global change, exerting pressures on soils and the ecosystem services they provide (Smith et al., 2016). The foremost factor that determines the direct impacts of human activities on agricultural soils is the intensity of land use, in terms of harvest frequency, usage of agrochemicals, animal stocking rates, irrigation and tillage. Effects of tillage intensity on soil biological properties and soil biodiversity are also of great interest because firstly, many soil functions are mediated by biological activities and secondly, soil organisms are often used as indicators of the status or “health” of soils (Briones, 2014; Doube & Schmidt, 1997; Capelle, Schrader, & Brunotte, 2012). In the case of arable land, much research has focussed on the type, depth, frequency and intensity of soil cultivation practices as drivers of environmental impacts, especially in relation to greenhouse gas balances (Lugato, Bampa, Panagos, Montanarella, & Jones, 2014; Six et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2016).

In agricultural soils, earthworms are the key agents in providing essential ecosystem services (Lee, 1985). Earthworms are nature's plough according to Darwin (1881) who first recognized this in his last book by indicating that our lands have been ploughed many times, and still are, well before this human implement was invented more than 4,000 years ago. Directly or indirectly, earthworms play a role in improving soil structure and soil porosity, nutrient cycling, plant growth and plant health. Under conservation tillage systems, earthworms play a more important role than under conventional tillage (CT) in the functioning of the farming systems as intensive cultural practices are often associated with decreases in their populations (e.g. Boström, 1988; Buckerfield & Wiseman, 1997; Cuendet, 1983; Curry, Byrne, & Schmidt, 2002; Tsiafouli et al., 2015; Capelle et al., 2012). However, the adoption of more sustainable managed systems does not always result in an increase in earthworm abundance and diversity (Berner et al., 2008; Chan, 2001). This conflicting picture might be the result of failing to examine the effects of CT under a broader scheme including the levels of tillage, agrochemical inputs, crop residue management, soil factors (texture, pH, soil moisture) and climate (Betrand et al., 2015; Chan, 2001).

Conventional inversion tillage has not significantly changed since its inception and is usually performed with a mouldboard plough that prepares a clean seedbed by burying all surface residues down to a depth of 20–40 cm, which is aimed at preventing weed, pest and disease proliferation and giving the crop the optimum germination conditions (Gajri, Arora, & Prihar, 2002). However, when the soil is turned over, earthworms are injured and killed directly, they become exposed to harsh environmental conditions and predators and, in the case of anecic worms (vertical burrowers), their biogenic structures (pores and tunnels) are destroyed and their food sources buried. These actions also bring other undesirable side effects such as depletion of soil organic matter (OM) (Lal, 2013), the deepening of the soil organic layer (Briones & Bol, 2003; Piccoli et al., 2016), plough-pan formation and soil compaction, as well as soil erosion, especially when extreme events (heavy rain, drought and strong

winds) hit the bare exposed soil (El Titi, 2003; Vršič, 2011). In addition, the number (secondary tillage/surface tillage after mouldboard tillage) and frequency of the tillage operations (per annum or per seasons) are also known to influence earthworm populations (e.g. Capowiez, Cadoux, Bouchant, Ruy, et al., 2009; Ivask, Kuu, & Sizov, 2007).

Alternative tillage practices, such as reduced, minimum and zero tillage, reduce the level and intensity of mechanical soil disturbance (Derpsch, Friedrich, Kassam, & Hongwen, 2010; Lal, 2013; Soane et al., 2012). They range from reducing the ploughing depth (shallow or superficial tillage), to loosening the soil without turning it (noninversion tillage), to direct seeding without any soil tillage (no-till). Finally, in recent years conservation tillage/agriculture has been increasingly adopted in which the soil is covered throughout the year, either by a cover crop or by the crop residues from the previous crop (Kassam, Friedrich, Shaxson, & Pretty, 2009). However, this is not always the case and sometimes crop residues are used somewhere else or superficially incorporated during seedbed preparation, when machinery for direct seeding is not available. Keeping the soil covered not only helps to prevent erosion but also sustains soil moisture and restores soil OM in the root zone (Lal, 2013).

However, soil texture has a substantial influence on the overall benefits of these less soil-disturbing practices. For example, some unstructured light sandy soils might not be suitable for noninversion tillage because the soil aggregates tend to form a compact structure that prevents air and water flow (Morris, Miller, & Froud-Williams, 2010). However, as OM improves aggregate stability (Ramos, Nacci, & Pla, 2003), combining noninversion tillage with practices that increase residue retention helps to reduce soil vulnerability to compaction (Zhang, Chan, Oates, Heenan, & Huang, 2007) and to encourage earthworms (Baker, Carter, Curry, Cultren, & Beck, 1998; Bittman & Kowalenko, 2004; Kladvik, Akhouri, & Weesies, 1997).

Furthermore, earthworm abundance and activities are also directly influenced by other soil factors including clay content (Baker et al., 1998) and pH (Edwards & Bohlen, 1996; Lee, 1985), but most importantly by food availability (Curry, 2004). Interestingly, the nature of the organic amendments applied to cultivated soils (e.g. farmyard manures, livestock slurries, composts, biochar, straw, green residues or even stubble retention) has produced contradictory results due to the paucity of the data (Betrand et al., 2015). Thus, whereas a supply of additional food sources usually promotes earthworm populations (Blanchet, Gavazov, Bragazza, & Sokrat, 2016; Crittenden, Eswaramurthy, de Goede, Brussaard, & Pulleman, 2014; D'Hose et al., 2016; Leroy, Schmidt, Van den Bossche, Reheul, & Moens, 2008; Schmidt, Clements, & Donaldson, 2003), other recent studies did not find any significant effect (e.g. Bamminger et al., 2014; Stroud, Irons, Watts, & Whitmore, 2016).

Other agricultural inputs such as insecticides, fungicides and herbicides can also affect earthworm populations in different ways (for a comprehensive review on the effects of different pesticides on earthworm species, see Datta, Singh, Singh, & Singh, 2016). In particular, the world's number one herbicide for weed control, glyphosate (*N*-(phosphonomethyl) glycine), has become of special concern at

European scale. It acts through enzyme inhibition in the Shikimate pathway, which is unique in plants, fungi and bacteria for producing aromatic amino acids (Herrmann & Weaver, 1999), and therefore, it was expected to have little or no impact on animals. However, there have been some reports of harmful effects on microorganisms, insects and frogs, which has prompted increased interest in investigating its potential adverse effects on field populations of earthworms (e.g. García-Pérez, Alarcón, Hernández, & Hernández, 2016; García-Pérez, Alarcón-Gutiérrez, Perroni, & Barois, 2014; García-Torres, Giuffré, Romaniuk, Ríos, & Pagano, 2014; Gaupp-Berghausen, Hofer, Rewald, & Zaller, 2015; Givaudan, Binet, Le Bot, & Wiegand, 2014) and to date, the results vary from negative to no effect.

Finally, the effects of tillage practices on earthworms can also be modulated by climatic factors. While at the global scale temperature and rainfall regimes determine the structure and composition of earthworm communities (Brussaard et al., 2012; Rutgers et al., 2016), at regional and local scales they also have a direct influence on the size of their populations and on their responses to agricultural inputs (e.g. Boudiaf, Methéri, Mouas, & Derridj, 2015; Velki & Ecimovic, 2015). However, tillage practices can override earthworms' environmental tolerance limits (Nieminen et al., 2011), making it difficult to disentangle the relative significance of each driver on the overall response.

Earthworms are, arguably, the most readily recognized and widely known group of soil animals. Therefore, the effects of tillage practices on earthworms are of very wide interest not only to scientists studying soils, cropping systems and biodiversity, but also to farmers, agronomists and agricultural advisors (Doube & Schmidt, 1997). Since Chan (2001) published his highly cited narrative review paper on the effects of tillage on earthworm communities, more empirical evidence has accumulated on the topic, including studies from underreported regions, studies on specific effects of tillage systems and/or agronomic practices and studies that have reported results on individual species rather than total earthworm numbers or biomass. Recent narrative reviews include Bertrand et al. (2015) and Datta et al. (2016). Considering the variety of interacting factors described above that can alter the overall effect of tillage operations on earthworm populations, a quantitative assessment is urgently needed to provide a more objective and clearer picture than previous reviews based on expert opinion or vote-counting methods (e.g. Capelle et al., 2012).

Meta-analysis (after Rosenberg, Adams, & Gurevitch, 1997) offers a robust methodology for combining data from multiple studies by weighing individual results (by replication and associated error term) and calculation of a standardized metric (effect size). The objective of the present study was to compile the available experimental field data on tillage and earthworms, and to use meta-analysis to globally quantify the magnitude of the response variable (here, earthworm population sizes) with regard to RT practices. We also tested whether principal soil characteristics (clay and soil organic C, soil texture and pH) or environmental variables (rainfall) could modulate population responses. In addition, as different degrees of tolerance to soil tillage have been reported depending on the species,

ecological groupings (epigeic, anecic and endogeic; sensu Bouché, 1977) and maturity stages, we also performed a quantitative analysis of the effects of RT practices on the species composition and ecological and age structure of earthworm populations.

2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 | Databases

In our literature survey, we attempted to include all available published studies that compared earthworm communities under CT (our control treatment) and any other forms of "RT" (experimental group) and that reported earthworm data obtained using quantitative sampling methodologies (i.e. quadrats, soil cores or blocks). However, we excluded papers based solely on indirect population assessment methods such as earthworm surface casts, middens and macropores (e.g. Miura et al., 2008; Singh et al., 2015). Studies were collected from peer-reviewed journals, as well as other sources such as book chapters, PhD dissertations, project reports and conference papers, as a recommended approach to reduce publication bias (McAuley, Pham, Tugwell, & Moher, 2000).

We compiled information from each of these papers (sometimes from related sources cited in the papers) on site location (longitude and latitude), year(s) of the study, method for earthworm collection, soil texture class (categorical variables); depth of hand-sorting, years of cultivation, % clay, % organic C and soil pH (all continuous variables). In addition, we extracted information on tillage operations, organic amendments and other agronomic practices (details in the following sections; see also Table 1). When the soil properties were reported per soil layer the averaged value of all soil layers was used. Importantly, where a publication failed to report key information, such as soil properties, we either contacted the authors/co-authors directly to obtain the missing details, or we used other published literature or data sources from the same site to gather site and soil descriptions and precipitation.

To account for different sampling efforts, all animal census data reported as numerical or graphical data were converted to individuals/m² and g/m² for abundance and biomass data, respectively. In the case of biomass data reported as dry weights or ash-free dry weights (e.g. Haukka, 1988; Hubbard, Jordan, & Stecker, 1999; Jordan, Gantzer, et al., 1997; Parmelee et al., 1990) we used the conversion factor 10 given by Petersen and Luxton (1982). Data presented only in graphic format was extracted using DataThief III software (Tummers, 2006).

From the entire existing literature we initially selected 215 potentially usable papers but only 165 published from 1950 to 2016, could be included in the analyses due to missing essential data (e.g. errors and/or sample sizes) or lack of a sound treatment comparison (e.g. absence of a true control). Data and metadata from the selected papers that met the criteria were inserted into data sets (Microsoft Excel), with each row representing an "individual record," that is containing earthworm data for tillage comparisons collected from a specific site, soil type and/or crop rotation or fertilization

TABLE 1 Tillage grouping categories used in the meta-analyses

Tillage categories (codes in brackets)	Common terminology for reduced tillage treatments used in the literature
No-tillage (NT)	No tillage, no-till No tillage + chemicals Zero tillage Direct seeding Direct sowing Direct drilling Cutting 3–4 cm wide slots by hand tool Unploughed Narrow-point openers (5–10 cm)
Shallow soil loosening (SSL) (Superficial tillage or Soil loosening <15 cm, noninversion tillage)	Minimum tillage Minimum tillage with soil loosening Minimal cultivation by dutzi noninversion cultivator and drilling Superficial tillage Coulter disc for planting Discing Tined cultivation Chisel Rotatory harrow Rotary hoe Subtill or subsurface tillage Cultivators Shallow loosening
Deep soil loosening (DSL) (Deep loosening >15 cm, vertical tillage, noninversion tillage)	Minimum tillage Erosion plough Chisel plough Chisel discing Deep tine cultivation Harrowing Rotary hoe Disc harrow Cultivators Deep Loosening Paraplow Ripping
Reduced tillage (RT) (Shallow ploughing, inversion tillage)	Shallow ploughing Reduced ploughing Ridge Ecomat (shallow inversive ploughing 10 cm) Two-layer ploughing (the double-layer plough turned the soil in the upper 15 cm and loosened it 10 cm below)
Conservation agriculture (CA)	Conservation agriculture Conservation tillage Layer cultivations No tillage (with crop residues retained and standing stubble or with cover crops as living mulch) Zero loading Shred-bedding (shredding stalks after harvest, followed by bedding on the old rows) Dibble stick to create a planting hole where seeds are placed plus crop residues retained as surface mulch ECO-tillage Volunteer ryegrass production Ridge till

management. When results from the same experiment were reported in different papers by the same or different authors, the most complete source of information, containing the longest investigated period, was selected (e.g. Hendrix, Muller, Bruce, Langdale, & Parmelee, 1992 and Parmelee et al., 1990; Eichhorn & Tebrügge,

1990 and Henke, 1994; Söchtig, 1992 and Söchtig & Larink, 1992; Radford, Key, Robertson, & Thomas, 1995 and Wilson-Rummenie, Radford, Robertson, Simpson, & Bell, 1999; Jordan, Gantzer, et al., 1997; Jordan, Stecker, et al., 1997; Potthoff, 1999 and Potthoff & Beese, 1998; Emmerling, 2001 and Webber & Emmerling, 2005;

Fortune, Kennedy, Mitchell, & Dunne, 2003 and Fortune et al., 2005; and Kennedy, Connery, Fortune, Forristal, & Grant, 2013; Riley, Pommeresche, Eltun, Hansen, & Korsæth, 2008 and Pommeresche & Loes, 2009; László, 2007 and Birkas, Bottlik, Stingli, Gyuricza, & Jolánkai, 2010; Joschko et al., 2009, 2012; Severon, Joschko, Barkusky, & Graefe, 2012 and Schirrmann et al., 2016). Similarly, if two papers reported results from the same experiment, but with sampling being performed in different seasons of the same year(s) or two consecutive years, the results from those samplings were averaged to produce one record for each experimental site (e.g. Krabbe, Driemeyer, Antonioli, & Giracca, 1993, 1994; Stancevičius, Jodaugienė, Špokienė, Raudonius, & Trečiokas, 2003; Jodaugienė, Raudonius, Špokienė, & Trečiokas, 2005; Tan et al., 1998, 2002). The only exceptions to this were when separate publications based on the same field experiment were the only source for building one of our specific databases (e.g. total biomass or abundances of single species, ecological groupings; see section dealing with earthworm data). In these cases, the publication was used to build that specific database irrespective of the length of the investigated period; in any case, two papers reporting the same study never contributed to the same data set. Table S1 shows a summary of the publications that contributed to each of the databases.

Reporting of results from a study with an associated error term (standard error, standard deviation, 95% confidence limits, percentiles or CV), together with the sample size (N), enabled the ready incorporation of these data into the databases. Furthermore, in the case of long-standing and well-documented studies, N was calculated as the number of replicate plots/sites \times number of study years, only if sampling was performed repeatedly over years, to give more weight to these longer-term studies in the analyses. This was done to avoid the ambiguity associated with extracting a single data point per measurement time series (Curtis, Mengersen, Lajeunesse, Rothstein, & Stewart, 2013) and to enable the comparisons between shorter and longer duration studies.

If the errors were reported as SED or LSD (i.e. the error value was associated with a difference between two means [pooled error estimate]) or if the type of error was not specified, we chose to calculate a new error for each treatment by averaging sampling times or rotations (see Table S1). However, in some cases, this was the only way to include these papers: Ellis, Elliott, Barnes, and Howse (1977); Barnes and Ellis (1979) (sites B clay winter wheat, Berkshire and Oxfordshire); Mallet, Lang, and Arathoon (1987); Karlen et al. (1994); Radford et al. (1995); Aslam, Choudhary, and Saggar (1999); Hutcheon, Iles, and Kendall (2001) (single species data set); Carter, Sanderson, Ivany, and White (2002); Pekrun, Schneider, Wüst, Jaus, and Claupein (2003); Zida, Ouédraogob, Mandoc, and Stroosnijder (2011); and Kennedy et al. (2013). Similarly, if a particular study totally failed to report the error associated to the mean, but showed data separately for several sampling dates (months, seasons), crop rotations, different sites, fertilization rates or soil types, the average value and associated error were calculated. This was a compromise to be able to include a number of these studies in the meta-data set; however, in these particular cases, to decrease their weight in

the analyses, the sample size was considered to be the number of values used to calculate the mean and SD . There were a few articles in which, although errors were reported, the image quality of the figure provided in the paper did not allow for an accurate extraction of the essential data (mean and error), and hence, as before, the individual means for each sampling occasion were averaged to obtain the mean and the associated SD and N values. In addition, a small number of studies provided multiple tillage comparisons but without errors. In this case, when the two most intensive and the two most reduced interventions rendered similar earthworm results, we paired and averaged them to obtain an SD for each combined tillage treatment ($N = 2$). Finally, because a number of studies (especially in the "grey literature") only reported one single record ($N = 1$), they could not be used for meta-analysis purposes.

As a result, three studies, despite reporting earthworm abundance data and meeting the meta-analysis criteria, had to be removed from the meta-data set due to mean and variance values of either control or experimental groups being equal to zero, which impeded the calculation of the effect size metric ($\ln R$). The final number of articles that contained useable earthworm abundance and biomass information (145 and 85, respectively) contributed with 284 and 157 observations, respectively, to these two databases used in the subsequent analyses.

Mean annual rainfall (MAR) values for each study site were obtained from each publication, if provided. When MAR was not reported in the original paper or could not be obtained through personal communication, values were obtained from the Meteorological Office Tables (1982) and from Müller (1982) for the nearest location at similar altitude. Climate zones were established using the Köppen classification system (Köppen, 1923, 1931), which divides the Earth into five main climate categories (A = tropical rain climate without cool season; B = dry climates; C = warm temperate climates; D = snow climates; and E = ice climates) and with further subdivisions according to the seasonal distribution and amount of rainfall and to the winter and summer temperature regimes (f = sufficient moisture in all months; s = dry season in the summer of the respective hemisphere; w = dry season in the winter of the respective hemisphere).

2.2 | Tillage categories, food inputs and crop protection factors

In his review, Chan (2001) pointed out that it is virtually impossible for a reader to understand all the regional differences in terminology and characteristics of all the tillage implements reported in the literature. Furthermore, many authors did not properly report the tillage operations (primary and secondary) performed for different cultivation treatments, or the type, dosage and timing of agrochemicals applied and/or how the crop residues were treated (i.e. intact/shredded/chopped, left on the surface/incorporated into the soil and burnt or not). Therefore, to avoid random exclusion/inclusion decisions, we adopted a pragmatic attitude and compared some form of "intensive/conventional" tillage implemented in the local area or region against a "reduced/minimal" version.

Accordingly, five categories of RT were defined (Table 1), as compared to "CT," the Control, which usually refers to inversion tillage down to a depth of 25 cm or more and typically using a mould-board plough, as follows: (i) "RT," which involves shallow ploughing (usually less than the top 15 cm gets turned over); (ii) "Deep soil loosening noninversion tillage" (DSL), defined as vertical tillage where the soil is loosened, broken or lifted to a depth >15 cm but not inverted (typically using a chisel plough or other tined tools); (iii) "Shallow soil loosening noninversion tillage" (SSL), as a tillage operation where the soil is loosened to a depth of no more than 15 cm; (iv) "No-tillage" (NT), with minimum or no soil disturbance other than a small incision for placing the seed (usually called "direct drilling," "direct seeding," "no-till"); and (v) "CA," defined in the literature as those systems with hardly any soil disturbance and a permanent cover of the soil surface (usually by leaving at least >30% of the previous crop's residue or by having the ground surface covered with dead or living mulch). However, we also decided to include in this last category those NT treatments where crop residues were left on the surface, but removed from the CT treatments. This allowed us to differentiate these studies from most reported cases where residues were removed from both CT and NT.

In addition, we also included a very small number of other studies, which did not compare tillage treatments specifically, but different ploughing depths (e.g. 15 cm vs. 25 cm; Söchtig, 1992; Söchtig & Larink, 1992; Bakken et al., 2009). In this case, the most intense tillage treatment was selected as CT and the other treatments with minimum or zero loading were classified as CA in the meta-data set.

Studies that included additional OM applications (e.g. straw, organic or green manures, mulching and cover crops) or specific residue management practices (e.g. burning) were only included in the meta-data set if they were applied in a comparable fashion to both the CT and the other form(s) of RT investigated. For example, when different fertilization inputs were superimposed onto the main tillage treatments, they were computed as two different records (e.g. CT + mineral fertilizer was compared to NT + mineral fertilizer and CT + organic fertilizer to NT + organic fertilizer). These subsets of studies were also used for additional meta-analyses to enable the distinction between the effects of the level and/or frequency of disturbance (i.e. tillage) and those derived from the amount and/or quality of food (i.e. linked to organic residues) added. Accordingly, we established a new grouping variable called "food inputs factor" to distinguish between those studies where the organic material retained in the CT and NT treatments either came from a secondary crop and was incorporated as "green" material (= cover crop, green manure, catch crop, etc.) or if they were true "harvest residues" derived from the main crop (i.e. straw and stubble), which are not green and low in N and that could be burnt or not (stubble), or whether they were supplied in the form of "animal manure" (i.e. derived from cattle or poultry) that are high in N. This enabled us to compare systems that included food addition with those where the crop residues were exported ("removed").

Similarly, to have a measure of the effects of agrochemical inputs on earthworm populations we also created another grouping factor

called "crop protection." In this case, we aimed to compare the effect of tillage in relation to the use different types of pesticides and herbicides, with special attention to the use of glyphosate, a broad-spectrum herbicide at the centre of current debate (see Introduction).

Other studies on earthworm populations that compared farming systems (e.g. conventional vs. organic farming systems) or agronomic treatments where only one tillage form had cover or catch crops, as well as those comparing land-use conversions (e.g. from tilled plots to grassland) were not included. In a few cases, data from the published literature originated from factorial experiments (i.e. tillage regimes × cropping systems × fertilization regimes) and, in these cases, the data inputted in the meta-data set for tillage represents a combination of the other factors (e.g. Marchão et al., 2009; Reeleder, Miller, Ball Coelho, & Roy, 2006; Rovira, Smettem, & Lee, 1987).

2.3 | Earthworm species, age and ecological groups

The available literature data are presented variably as populations of different species, a few species or for the whole community (see Table S1). This issue was resolved through the construction of two separate subsets of data: (i) total numbers and biomass of earthworms and (ii) abundances of every single species. However, when only one species was identified and it was highly dominant (i.e. representing >80%–90% of the total population), then the collated data contributed to the total numbers meta-data set and also to the subsidiary species-specific one. This was the case of Tanck, Santos, and Dionísio (2000) (*Amyntas* spp. only); Clapperton, Miller, Larney, and Lindwall (1997), Clapperton (1999) and Rosas-Medina et al. (2010) (*Aporrectodea caliginosa*); Hubbard et al. (1999) (*Aporrectodea trapezoides*); Reeleder et al. (2006) (*Aporrectodea turgida*); Errouissi, Moussa-Machraoui, Ben-Hammouda, and Nourira (2011) and Mallet et al. (1987) (*Lumbricus terrestris*); Zida et al. (2011) (*Dichogaster affinis*); Brito-Vega et al. (2009) (*Phoenicodrilus taste*); and Domínguez and Bedano (2016) (*Microsclex phosphoreus*). Subsequently, we analysed the abundances of the most reported species in the literature to test whether certain species were more sensitive than others to RT practices.

In addition, a small number of papers also provided information about the age and the ecological structure of the earthworm communities which allowed us to build two additional meta-data sets: (iii) abundances of mature (adults and subadults) and immature individuals and (iv) numbers of worms in the epigeic, anecic and endogeic ecological group. As juvenile earthworms usually constitute the majority of the individuals in these agricultural soils (e.g. Domínguez & Bedano, 2016; Marwitz, Ladewig, & Märländer, 2012) and as they can be very sensitive to tillage (e.g. Ulrich, Tischer, Hofmann, & Christen, 2010), it is important to determine the effects of management practices on this seldom measured component of earthworm populations. Similarly, because the ecological classification of earthworms clearly reflects where they preferentially feed and burrow (*sensu* Bouché, 1977), the effect of tillage practices is expected to have a stronger effect on those species linked to the surface layers

(i.e. epigeics and anecics) that are more exposed to disturbance than on those building horizontal burrows in the deeper mineral layers (i.e. endogeics).

2.4 | Grouping variables

In the case of some categorical and numerical variables, pregrouping is needed before conducting meta-analyses to achieve maximum in-group homogeneity (Jeffery, Verheijen, van der Velde, & Bastos, 2011). Accordingly, soil texture was grouped into three broad classes: clayey, sandy and loamy/silty, either as it was reported in the paper or as estimated from the particle size distribution using an online calculator (https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/survey/?cid=nrcs142p2_054167). Earthworm extraction methods were classified into five groups: hand-sorting, chemical extraction (formalin, mustard or permanganate), chemical + hand-sorting (i.e. combination of the two previous methods), electrical (octet method) and "other methods" which included the less commonly used techniques for collecting earthworms (Berlese, wet sieving and the combination of electrical and hand-sorting).

In the case of continuous variables (such as rainfall, soil clay and soil organic C contents, soil pH, ploughing depth and years of cultivation), the use of ungrouped data would have led to a substantial loss of information. This can be related to the high precision of their measurements, which typically results in an insufficient number of records within each group (see, e.g., Jeffery et al., 2011). To group variables uniformly across studies and to avoid subjective intervals, the groupings were established according to criteria used in well referenced world databases. For example, MMR values are typically plotted in 100-, 200- or 500-mm intervals (e.g. <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/time-series/global>) and here they were classified into three groupings: <500, 500–1,000 and >1,000 mm. Similarly, following the codesets proposed in the Harmonized World Soil database (Nachtergaele et al., 2008), we classified the clay content values across studies by grouping the data according to three simplified topsoil textural classes: "coarse-textured soils," <18% clay; "medium-textured," 18%–35% clay; and "fine-textured," >35% clay. Equally, we also followed this recommended classification for grouping organic C contents: <0.6%, 0.6%–1.2%, 1.2%–2.0% and >2.0%. Finally, in the case of soil pH, three categories were used: "very acid soils," pH < 5.5; "acid to neutral," pH = 5.5–7.2; and "carbonate-rich soils," pH > 7.2, to take into account the pH dependence of aluminium solubility and possible toxic effects (Haynes & Mokolobate, 2001; Nachtergaele et al., 2008).

In addition, the ploughing depth varies with effective root zone of the crop and has important implications for water storage and nutrient availability (Riley & Ekeberg, 1998). We therefore grouped the information about depth of ploughing in the CT treatment into three classes: "shallow ploughing" (<20 cm), "normal mouldboard ploughing" (20–25 cm) and "deep ploughing" (>25 cm), according to the definitions found in the published literature (e.g. Bakken et al., 2009; Kouwenhoven, Perdok, Boer, & Oomen, 2002; Parvin, Parvage, & Etana, 2014).

In the case of food inputs, due to the paucity of the data, we classified the selected studies into just two categories: "with OM additions," including all those papers where any kind of organic material was added to all the tillage treatments compared; and "without OM additions" referring to all those papers in which no organic materials were added to the experimental plots and all crop residues were removed from the fields. Similarly, we established three classes for the agrochemical grouping variable: "P" when standard pesticides were applied to the experimental treatments; "HnoG" when herbicides were used but glyphosate was not one of them; and "G" when glyphosate was included in the crop protection management practices.

Finally, the studies reported in the selected papers included in our meta-analyses showed great variability in relation to the numbers of years of controlled cultivation, ranging from <1 year to 48 years, with the majority being cultivated for fewer than 10 years. It is known that long- and short-term cultivations can have different effects on soil properties (Mubarak, Elshami, & Azhari, 2005). Therefore, to examine the effects of agricultural history and length of field experiments on the responses of earthworm communities we established three categories for the duration of cultivation: <10 years, 10–20 years and >20 years.

2.5 | Meta-analyses

We used meta-analysis techniques (Rosenberg, Adams, & Gurevitch, 2000) to determine the effect of tillage on earthworm populations. Calculations were based on random-effects models (Hedges, Gurevitch, & Curtis, 1999; Rosenberg et al., 2000). In the categorical random-effects model, groups with fewer than two valid studies were excluded from each analysis. Resampling tests were generated from 999 iterations.

We defined the "control" group in the meta-analyses to be the conventional treatment and the "experimental" groups all five other tillage practices (RT, DSL, SSL, NT and CA) in which densities were expected to be higher than under conventional, more intensive agricultural cultivation. We calculated the mean effect size using MetaWin version 2 statistical software (Rosenberg et al., 2000) as a weight cumulative effect size based on the variance of the sample and expressed as the natural logarithm of the response ratio (R):

$$\text{LnR} = \text{Ln} \left(\frac{\bar{X}^E}{\bar{X}^C} \right)$$

where \bar{X}^E is the mean earthworm abundance or biomass in the experimental treatment and \bar{X}^C is the mean earthworm abundance or biomass in the control treatment (CT). The reason for using the natural logarithm is that it linearizes the metric and reduces the skewness of the sampling distribution of R (Hedges et al., 1999).

To test the effects of publication bias (Rothstein, Sutton, & Borenstein, 2005), we used the fail-safe *N* technique (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). This involved computing the combined *p* value for all of the studies included, and calculating the number of additional studies showing no effect (i.e. average *Z* value of 0) that would be

needed to change the p value from significant to nonsignificant at $p = .05$. Therefore, the robustness of the findings of the meta-analysis is directly correlated with the size of the fail-safe N number.

All graphical outputs are forest plots showing the effect size (LnR) calculated from each group. On the X-axis, the “effect size” was exponentially transformed and reported as the percentage change in earthworm populations (abundance or biomass; i.e. $[R - 1] \times 100$; Jeffery et al., 2011). Therefore, each point represents the mean effect size for each grouping, with the horizontal error bar lines indicating the 95% confidence intervals (CIs). All graphs display the grand mean effect at the top and then in decreasing order of effect size values, except in the case of continuous variables, where the categorical groups were defined according to intervals (i.e. rainfall, % clay, % C, soil pH, ploughing depth and years of cultivation) which are shown sequentially.

Finally, we used meta-regressions (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009) under random model effects to assess the relationship between the effect size (LnR; dependent variable) and each of the six continuous independent variables (rainfall, clay and organic C contents, soil pH, ploughing depth and years of cultivation). The significance level of the heterogeneity of the model (Q_M), that is the variation in the effect sizes that is explained by the model, was tested against a χ^2 distribution with 1 df which is equivalent to calculating the significance level of the slope against a normal distribution (Rosenberg et al., 2000). From this, a significant Q_M means that the independent variable explains a significant amount of the variability in effect sizes and a significant Q_E (amount of residual error heterogeneity) implies that there is still heterogeneity among the effect sizes that is not explained by the model.




FIGURE 1 Number of included studies on the effect of tillage practices on earthworm abundances by continent of origin

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Total earthworm abundance and biomass

From the larger abundance data set, it can be seen that although the majority of the investigations were performed in Europe and America (in particular, North America), studies from Africa (Tunisian Republic, Burkina Faso and the Republics of Cameroon, Kenya, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Madagascar), Oceania (five studies from Australia and four from New Zealand) and Asia (Iran, India, China, Japan) also contributed to the meta-analysis (Figure 1).

Rosenthal's fail-safe N for the abundance data ranged from 1,024 to 25,171 and in the case of biomass, from 200 to 13,779, with the lowest values obtained for those grouping classes that only included very few studies due to the paucity of data (e.g. food inputs and crop protection grouping factors). Nonetheless, even in those cases, a minimum number of 200 observations with an average Z value of zero would have been needed to significantly change the outcome of the meta-analyses of these two data sets. In contrast, a much larger number of these observations (>13,000) would have been needed to reach different conclusions for tillage treatments, rainfall and climate zone, sampling method, soil texture and years of cultivation. Consequently, we can conclude confidently that publication bias in our literature survey was highly unlikely to have a significant effect on the interpretations and conclusions.

3.2 | Influence of sampling methods

The per cent response to a change in tillage practices (i.e. “conventional” vs. “other forms of reduced” tillage) calculated separately for earthworm sampling methods showed that with the exception of the octet method, all collection techniques detected significantly greater abundance and biomass in soils under RT than under conventional treatments (Figure 2). The sample means of the different techniques were not significantly different between them ($p > .05$), reflecting that hand-sorting (the most commonly used method by researchers), chemical expulsion using formalin or mustard and the combination of these two methods seem to be similarly efficient in estimating earthworm populations (both abundance and biomass) in agricultural soils (Figure 2). In the two earthworm data sets, the “other methods” category, encompassing a small number of studies with miscellaneous methods, such as wet sieving, Berlese extractors and the combination of hand-sorting with electrical or soil sieving, had variable results, but recorded a greater treatment effect than the other sampling techniques (Figure 2).

3.3 | Influence of tillage and other management practices

Significantly larger earthworm populations, in terms of abundance and biomass, were observed with decreasing intensity in agricultural management ($p < .05$; Figure 3a,b). NT and CA resulted in the




FIGURE 2 The effect of sampling method on earthworm abundance (a) and biomass (b) as a percentage change of the control. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control–treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived




FIGURE 3 The effect of the different forms of reduced tillage treatments on earthworm abundance (a) and biomass (b) as a percentage of the control. For treatment codes, see Table 1. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control–treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived

greatest percentage of change in earthworm populations compared to conventional controls (abundance: 137% and 127% and biomass: 196% and 101% under NT and CA, respectively). With other tillage categories, the more the soil was disturbed, the less beneficial the effects on earthworms were, with DSL (noninversion tillage) and reduced (inversion) tillage non-significant effects compared to conventional practices (Figure 3a,b).

The depth of ploughing during CT practices also affected earthworm populations, although the overall effect of this classification factor was not significant. However, for both data sets working depths <20 cm tended to have the greatest positive effect size, reflecting a larger increase in earthworm biomass and abundance with RT (Figure 4a,b).

The importance of how deep soil is conventionally ploughed in controlling earthworm populations was also partially evidenced by a negative relationship between the effect size metric and this variable, with the model being statistically significant for earthworm numbers but not biomass (Figure 5). Furthermore, although the meta-regression model for abundance data showed the best goodness of fit, in both cases there was a significant amount of heterogeneity in the data, which was not explained by the model (Figure 5).

Another important effect agricultural management had on earthworm populations was related to the availability of organic materials

(OM). The presence of a catch crop, of crop residues from the previous year (either left on the soil surface or incorporated into the soil) and/or the addition of organic amendments (such as animal manures) provide food and habitat space for earthworms in these cultivated soils. Consequently, a greater positive effect of RT intensity on earthworm populations was observed when any of those supplementary food materials were provided in field studies compared to when they were removed (Figure 4c,d), with the results being significant for the abundance data only ($p = .020$; Figure 4c).

Surprisingly, the effects of RT intensity on earthworm population sizes, categorized by the use of crop protection substances, were not statistically significant ($p > .05$) and with the outcome of using pesticides showing the more variable results (Figure 4e,f). However, when herbicides were added, a positive effect on earthworms was observed, with glyphosate having the greatest positive effect (Figure 4e,f).

Finally, earthworm population sizes tended to show a greater response to RT over time (Figure 4g,h). This effect was significantly greater for studies with cultivation treatments in place for at least 10–20 years (126% and 137% change in abundance and biomass, respectively) compared to studies with cultivation duration of fewer than 10 years (64% and 73% positive effect for abundance and biomass, respectively). Because the number of studies that included sites cultivated for more than 20 years was low, the response ratio for this categorical class showed a much greater variability (Figure 4g,h).




FIGURE 4 The effect of ploughing depth in the Conventional control (a and b), organic matter (OM) additions (c and d), agrochemicals use (e and f; P = pesticides; HG = glyphosate was used as herbicide; HnoG = any other type of herbicides was used for crop protection but no glyphosate) and the number of years of cultivation (g and h) on earthworm abundance (left) and biomass (right) as a percentage of the control. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control–treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived

These results for duration of experimental treatments were borne out further by the outcome of the meta-regression analyses (Figure 6), indicating that the slope in both regression models (abundance and biomass) was probably not zero, which suggests that the longer the duration of reduced cultivation, the larger earthworm population will be (Figure 6). Even though both meta-regression models were significant, there was an important amount of

heterogeneity in the two data sets that was not fully explained by the number of years the land had been under cultivation.

3.4 | Influence of climatic factors

The response ratio of earthworm abundance and biomass to change in tillage practices was significantly affected by annual rainfall




FIGURE 5 Random-effects model—regression of the log response ratio of earthworm abundance (a) and biomass (b) versus reported ploughing depth in the Conventional control




FIGURE 6 Random-effects model—regression of the log response ratio of earthworm abundance (a) and biomass (b) versus years of cultivation

amounts ($p = .022$ and $p = .008$, respectively; Figure 7a,b). Although there was a positive response for each of the three categories, a significantly greater response in earthworm abundance and biomass was observed in more humid areas ($>1,000$ mm per annum) compared to study sites where the mean annual precipitation ranged between 500 and 1,000 mm (Figure 7a,b). In addition, low rainfall (<500 mm) values were also associated with positive increases in earthworm populations in the less intensively tilled soils (Figure 7a,b).

These results were borne out further when the data were categorized according to climate zones ($p = .002$ and $p = .008$ for abundance and biomass, respectively; Figure 7c,d), with the largest effect on earthworm populations being observed in cold climates with a dry season in the winter (Cw). Significantly lower, but still positive effects, were also found in C (dry) and D (snow) climates with sufficient moisture all months (Cf and Df). Even warm tropical rain climates, with monthly temperatures $>18^{\circ}\text{C}$ all year round, promoted




FIGURE 7 The effect of annual rainfall (a and b; in mm) and the Köppen climate classification (c and d; the first letter refers to the main climates: A = tropical rain climate without cool season; B = dry climates; C = warm temperate climates; and D = snow climates; and the second letter to the further subdivisions according to the seasonal distribution and amount of rainfall and to the winter and summer temperature regimes: f = sufficient moisture in all months; s = dry season in the summer of the respective hemisphere; and w = dry season in the winter of the respective hemisphere) on earthworm abundance (left) and biomass (right) as a percentage of the control. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control–treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived

earthworm abundances under RT operations, but only if a dry period occurred in the winter (Figure 7c).

This positive response of earthworm populations under all rainfall categories explains the absence of a significant regression relationship between the response ratio of earthworm numbers and biomass and rainfall amounts when analysed as a continuous variable ($p > .05$; results not shown).

3.5 | Influence of soil factors

Earthworm numbers and biomass responses to changes in agricultural management also varied with soil texture, although the overall effect of this grouping variable was not statistically significant, likely due to large variance of the few studies conducted on sandy soils (Figure 8a,b). However, all soil textural classes analysed here showed a positive effect on earthworm population sizes. In the case of abundance, a statistically significant increase was observed for clayey soils compared to loamy textures (Figure 8a), whereas these two soil textures rendered similar results for the biomass data (Figure 8b).

By contrast, when grouping the response ratios by percentage clay classes (Figure 8c,d), there was a significant effect of soil clay content on earthworm abundance ($p = .011$), and the result for earthworm biomass was marginally significant ($p = .07$). In both cases, the highest clay content was associated with the largest effect on earthworm populations (on average, 167% and 209% change

when soils contained $>35\%$ clay; Figure 8c,d), with the differences to the soils with least clay content ($<18\%$) being significant.

This positive relationship between the response ratio of earthworm populations (numbers and biomass) and soil clay content was also confirmed by the results from the meta-regression analyses (Figure 9), indicating that significant increases in earthworm communities under less intensive cultivation occurred on soils with finer textures. However, in the case of the biomass data, although the clay content explained a significant amount of variation in the response ratio, there was still heterogeneity not being fully explained by the model (Figure 9b).

There was no statistically significant effect of RT practices on earthworm abundance and biomass when the soils were classified according to their organic C contents (Figure 8e,f). All four analysed intervals showed positive effects, but larger effect size trends relative to the control tillage treatment were observed for the lower organic C contents ($<0.6\%$ in the case of abundance data and $<1.2\%$ for biomass). There were no significant differences between the four categories tested (i.e. $<0.6\%$, $0.6\%–1.2\%$, $1.2\%–2.0\%$ and $>2.0\%$) and accordingly, the meta-regression analyses also failed to produce a significant relationship between $\ln(R)$ and the soil C contents reported in the literature ($p > .05$; results not shown).

Finally, the response ratio of earthworm abundance and biomass to less intensive cultivation was significantly affected by soil pH ($p = .005$ and $p = .027$, respectively; Figure 8g,h). Even though




FIGURE 8 The effect of soil texture (a and b), soil clay content (c and d; in %), soil organic carbon content (e and f; in %) and soil pH (g and h) on earthworm abundance (left) and biomass (right) as a percentage of the control. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control-treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived

there was a positive response for the three categories tested, a statistically significant increase in earthworm populations was observed in the acidic soils ($\text{pH} < 5.5$), despite the fact that the studies comprising this category showed the greatest variance. This result was also confirmed by the negative relationships, albeit not significant, between the response of earthworm populations to RT and the soil pH values recorded at the investigated sites ($p > .05$; results not shown).

3.6 | Community structure

Sixty papers provided information about abundances of different earthworm species under conventional and "other reduced forms of tillage"; however, only 51 studies met the meta-analyses criteria and contributed with 260 records for a total number of 31 species. Unfortunately, just over a third of these species were only reported in single published articles (i.e. $N = 1$), which did not allow the




FIGURE 9 Random-effects model—regression of the log response ratio of earthworm abundance (a) and biomass (b) versus soil clay content (%)




FIGURE 10 (a) Mean changes in the abundance of individually reported earthworm species as a percentage of the control in response to reduced forms of tillage (AH, *Allolobophora chlorotica*; AC, *Aporrectodea caliginosa*; AG, *Aporrectodea georgii*; AI, *Aporrectodea icterica*; AL, *Aporrectodea longa*; AT, *Aporrectodea trapezoides*; ATUB, *Aporrectodea tuberculata*; ATUG, *Aporrectodea turgida*; AR, *Aporrectodea rosea*; LT, *Lumbricus terrestris*; LR, *Lumbricus rubellus*; LC, *Lumbricus castaneus*; OCTO, *Octolasion* spp.). (b) Mean changes in earthworm abundance of different age groups as a percentage of the control in response to reduced forms of tillage. (c) Mean changes in earthworm ecological groups' abundance as a percentage of the control in response to reduced forms of tillage. Mean effect and 95% confidence intervals are shown. Sample sizes are shown on the right of each confidence interval, first the number of control–treatment pairs followed (after the slash) by the number of studies from which the comparisons were derived

calculation of the response ratio. In addition, a small number of species were recorded in 2–3 studies, which resulted in their associated variance values being, in some cases, up to 20 times higher than for the rest. Therefore, Figure 10a only shows the response ratio of the 13 most frequently reported species to RT intensity. It can be seen that grouping the data according to earthworm species composition showed a statistically significant effect of RT on earthworm species' abundances ($p = .001$). Furthermore, significant increases in the abundances occurred for the majority of the species reported in the literature, with the largest effects being observed for *L. terrestris* and *Lumbricus rubellus*. Only three species (recorded in a small number of studies) showed no statistical significant response to changes in tillage, namely *Aporrectodea icterica*, *A. trapezoides* and *A. turgida* (Figure 10a).

3.7 | Age structure

A limited number of papers (29) reported data on the numbers of mature and immature worms collected from each of the tillage treatments, but after removing all those studies that did not meet the meta-analysis criteria, only 23 papers contributed to the metaset providing 76 records on age classes.

The meta-analyses of this much smaller data set revealed that applying other forms of RT had a slightly stronger effect on adult worms than on the immature ones (Figure 10b), but the difference between these two life cycle stages of earthworm was not significant.

3.8 | Functional groups

Among the literature reviewed, 43 papers included information about the responses of the three well recognized earthworm ecological groupings (epigeic, anecic and endogeic worms, sensu Bouché, 1977). After a thorough checking for their suitability for meta-analysis purposes, 39 studies were included in the metaset, contributing 174 records.

The result of this meta-analysis highlighted the significantly stronger responses of the epigeic and anecic worms to reduced forms of tillage than those exhibited by the endogeics, although all three groups showed a significant positive response ($p = .001$; Figure 10c). Indeed, the former two ecological groups showed an overall increase >100% (117% and 123%, respectively) when tillage was reduced.

4 | DISCUSSION

Overall, the results of this meta-analysis demonstrate that earthworm population sizes increase when tillage intensity is reduced, reaching the highest values when the least intensive practices, that is no-till and CA, are applied. This effect was consistent across the two databases analysed (abundance and biomass); however, besides tillage, other agronomic and environmental factors (e.g. OM

additions, climatic conditions and soil characteristics) modulated the observed responses.

4.1 | General effects of reducing tillage intensity on earthworm abundance and biomass

From our extensive global review, it is clear that besides the direct effects of the different tillage implements used to prepare the soil for planting (mouldboard plough, chisel, disc, harrows, etc.), the intensity (i.e. how deep is the soil disturbed) and other agronomic practices (e.g. handling of crop residues) also have strong influences on earthworm populations (Edwards, 1983; Ivask et al., 2007; Lee, 1985). Consequently, the entire "cropping calendar" (encompassing tillage operations, planting, fertilizing, adding crop protection substances, harvesting and handling the crop residues) determines the overall outcome of the impact of tillage on earthworms and could explain the inconsistent results reported in the literature (see, e.g., Chan, 2001 for a general overview of these conflicting views).

Furthermore, in agreement with several individual studies (Bogužas, Kairytė, & Jodaugienė, 2010; Gerard & Hay, 1979), we found a significant negative relationship between ploughing depth and earthworm abundance. Interestingly, our meta-analyses also confirmed that the shallower the soil inversion is, the greater the chance that the resilient populations would recover and build larger numbers under RT (Gerard & Hay, 1979), also possibly helped by less alterations in water stable aggregates (Bogužas et al., 2010) and OM distribution along the soil profile (Briones & Bol, 2003; Piccoli et al., 2016).

Regarding how frequently the soil is ploughed, among the studies included in our meta-analyses, only eight trials specified that ploughing was performed only once a year (usually in autumn/fall period), another four papers indicated that this operation took place in spring and one that the soil was ploughed in both seasons. However, the vast majority of the published papers merely stated "annual ploughing," "conventional ploughing" or "mouldboard ploughing" without specifying when exactly this operation took place. It has been noticed that this lack of detailed descriptions of tillage practices in the published reports is also to blame for the contrasting findings reported by the different authors (Chan, 2001). Despite some studies reporting that spring ploughing was particularly negative for immature worms (De St. Remy & Day-Nard, 1982; Marinissen, 1992), their results were inconclusive probably because of the confounding effects of samplings at specific times when favourable climatic conditions and organic applications took place.

Another interesting aspect that contributes to the conflicting picture of the effects of tillage on earthworms is the land-use history, that is how many years the soil has been cultivated, what the previous use of the land was and how much time has passed since its last conversion to arable land. This is important because the ability of earthworm communities to adapt to a soil environment that has been ploughed once or several times every year is expected to increase over time, as the more resilient species will remain in the community. Therefore, soon after land-use conversion, mortality

rates are expected to be higher than in those soils that have been cultivated for many years, but food supply can also be higher temporarily, for instance, after grassland conversion (Edwards, 1983), and individual fields will differ in their suitability for recolonization by earthworms from field margins (Roarty & Schmidt, 2013). Therefore, the available literature offers contrasting responses, ranging from prompt recoveries after a few months (e.g. Marinissen, 1992) to population numbers remaining very low after many years of cultivation (25–30 years; e.g. Barley, 1959; Low, 1972), but also either increases and decreases at time intervals of just a few years (<10 years; see also Chan, 2001 for detailed descriptions).

In our quantitative survey, we found a very strong positive response of earthworm populations to RT operations when the soil had been under RT for a long time (>10 years) and significant percentages of change in both earthworm numbers (117%–126%) and biomass (75%–137%) were observed. The limited number of long-term studies (>20 years) did not allow us to reach a clear conclusion on earthworm population recovery from CT in the long term. However, the fact that the two means (abundance and biomass) for this effective class were greater than the grand mean suggests that a similar trend is expected, although it will need to be confirmed in future research. The discrepancy with those studies reporting rapid recoveries after conversion to RT can be explained by the confounding effects of other factors besides tillage, for example by having legumes as a catch crop (Boström, 1995), the application of manures (Marinissen, 1992), the presence of large, species-rich earthworm communities in field margins and/or the use of unrealistically small plots in experiments that can be recolonized quickly (Roarty & Schmidt, 2013) or by more favourable weather conditions for earthworm reproduction at the time of the sampling (e.g. Curry, 2004).

Leaving the crop residues after crop harvest instead of removing them from the fields in preparation for the next cropping season is another major factor that likely explains the contrasting observations in earthworm responses to tillage in the literature (Curry, 2004; Schmidt et al., 2003). Crop residue retention provides a protective layer that prevents soil water evaporation and supplies additional food for earthworms (Curry, 2004). It also increases cation exchange capacities over time due to the accumulation of organic carbon in the top soil. Certain management practices, such as burning the straw residues after harvest, have negative effects on carbon sequestration, with 36% losses in the top after 100 years of annual burning compared with areas that were not burned (Spagnollo, 2004). In spite of the ecological importance of residue handling, very few studies across our literature survey provided detailed descriptions of how the harvest residues were managed and whether other organic materials such as green residues and/or animal manures were added in the control and experimental treatments under comparison. However, the information provided by the studies available allowed us to confirm that adding a potential food source for earthworms amplifies their response to RT; in other words, reduced disturbance combined with larger food supply increases earthworm populations greatly (Schmidt et al., 2003). The results from our meta-analyses for residue additions were significant for earthworm numbers but not for

biomass, possibly due to the difference in the number of observations included in each data set (69 vs. 31) and, hence, in the number of degrees of freedom. It should also be pointed out that in our meta-study, we included in the “CA” category all those experimental designs in which the no-till treatments retained the crop residues but that were removed from the control plots, with the aim of counteracting for the change in another important factor besides the tillage. However, the data set also contained a few studies that compared conventional agriculture with other forms of RT (shallow and DSL) in which crop residues were used as mulch, which makes it very difficult to separate the effects of each factor.

Intensive agricultural production systems often involve the application of various chemical substances with the aim of protecting the growing crop against damage by pests and diseases. Even in less intensive systems the use of synthetic pesticides is widespread and of environmental concern due to their long persistence in the soil (Srimurali, Govindaraj, Kumar, & Rajendran, 2015). Their toxic effects could reach nontarget organisms such as earthworms and decrease their survival and reproduction rates and affect their behaviour (see review by Datta et al., 2016). However, the results of our meta-analyses showed an enormous variability in the responses of earthworms to pesticides, likely due to the fact that more than one type of chemical compound were involved and that very often cocktails of herbicides, fungicides and insecticides are applied to the soils or as seed dressings. Specifically, we did not find any significant effect of the use of glyphosate on earthworm populations and both abundance and biomass tended to be even greater when this herbicide was used in the fields (on average 35% increase compared with the overall mean). Other studies did not observe any detrimental effects of this broad-spectrum herbicide on earthworm populations (Fusilero et al., 2013) and in some occasions the response was species-dependent (Givaudan et al., 2014) or being modulated by other factors such as a reduction in root colonization by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (Zaller, Heigl, Ruess, & Grabmaier, 2014). Different herbicide dosages, combinations with other agrochemicals and the fact that this kind of research has been usually performed under laboratory conditions might explain the differences and highlights the need for more field research to clarify whether the observed increases are the result of direct or indirect effects.

4.2 | The modulating effects of abiotic factors

Across all five continents and all climates, the response of earthworm populations to decreasing tillage intensity was greater in warm temperate climates with a dry season in the winter and warm/hot summers (i.e. with at least 4 months of mean temperatures above 10°C) according to the Köppen classification system (Köppen, 1923, 1931). This highlights the important role of temperature and moisture gradients on earthworm population dynamics and their seasonal variations across the globe (e.g. Hackenberger & Hackenberger, 2014; Kanianska, Jad'ud'ová, Makovniková, & Kizeková, 2016; Lavelle & Spain, 2001; Moron-Rios, Rodriguez, Perez-Camacho, & Rebollo, 2010; Najar & Khan, 2011; Redmond, Kesheimer, & Potter,

2014). Accordingly, seasonal mortality rates have been attributed to water shortages, but high rainfall conditions have also been linked to earthworm declines due to the low nutrient status of these moist soils (Fragoso & Lavelle, 1992). However, the optimum values for earthworm activities and reproduction might vary for different species and ecological groups (Curry, 2004). This might explain why our meta-analyses results showed the contrasting result of having more positive responses of earthworms to RT either in rainy areas (>1,000 mm on average per year) or in regions with low annual precipitation values (<500 mm). Furthermore, wet cultivated soils are more prone to soil compaction (tillage-pan formation) and several studies have reported earthworm avoidance of and higher mortality rates in soils degraded by compaction and tillage-pans (Birkas, Jolánkaï, Gyuricza, & Percze, 2004; Capowiez, Cadoux, Bouchand, Roger-Estrade, et al., 2009; Radford, Wilson-Rummenie, Simpson, Bell, & Fergusson, 2001). Therefore, the recovery of the earthworm populations (or more specifically, of the resilient species/ecological groupings) might be encouraged by drier conditions. On the other hand, positive responses in dry climates can also be expected because RT conserves water (Blevins, Smith, Thomas, & Frye, 1983), prolonging active periods for earthworms.

In addition, previous studies have found that the negative impacts of intensive tillage on earthworm populations are also greater in finely textured soils (i.e. with a high percentage of clay) due to the fact that these light particles dry out very quickly when they are turned over (Chan, 2001). In agreement with these findings, the greatest change in earthworm populations to reductions in tillage intensity was observed in clayey soils (123%). Furthermore, the results from our meta-regression analyses indicated that earthworms showed the largest positive response to RT with higher soil clay contents (>35%). It is known that heavy clay soils usually support higher population numbers due to their higher water retention, which are important factors for earthworm survival (Baker et al., 1998; Curry, 2004; Gerard & Hay, 1979). Also, in relation to this, clay soils tend to retain OM more tightly than coarse-textured soils. The reasons can be found in the chemical bonds that are formed on the surface of clay particles that hold OM and slow down its decomposition, together with a greater tendency for the clay soils to form aggregates, which protect the OM from microbial attack (Rice, 2002).

Indeed, the positive relationship between soil organic carbon and earthworm density has also been observed previously (Hendrix et al., 1992). The studies included in this review, which covered a good range of carbon contents (from 0.18% in some African sandy soils to around 12% in Mexican clay soils) showed that on average, higher carbon contents were linked to higher population numbers. While the meta-regression analyses did not reveal a significant response of earthworm populations to RT in relation to the carbon content of the soils as a single factor, it did show that the largest percentage of change in earthworm densities ($\approx 132\%$) in response to RT occurred in those soils with the lowest organic content (<0.6%). Agricultural managements leading to lower soil carbon contents generally support fewer earthworms (e.g. Ayuke et al., 2011; Curry, 2004). It is therefore plausible that RT leading to higher soil C contents (Blevins

et al., 1983) is most beneficial for earthworms in soils with the lowest soil C baseline values. Overall, the amount of carbon present in the soil might not be a good sole predictor of tillage impacts on soil invertebrate communities because other factors such as rainfall patterns and previous land-use history could be masking the overall effects (Guo & Gifford, 2002). For example, some studies have observed that soil carbon content in the top soil tends to increase in the more conservative agricultural operations because of a greater accumulation of crop residues on the surface and the absence of a disturbed soil profile compared to the ploughed soils (Kibet, Blanco-Canqui, & Jasa, 2016; Piccoli et al., 2016). However, these effects seem to be climate-dependent, with a maximum in soil C occurring after a wet preceding year and minimum after a dry preceding year (e.g. Conyers et al., 2015).

Similarly, other studies have reported an increase in soil OM concomitant with a decrease in soil pH; for instance, Gillman (1985) indicated that for 1% increase in soil carbon, soil pH declines by 1 unit. Consequently, in the long-term soil OM accumulation under RT might result in soil acidification especially in low pH buffering capacity soils (Conyers et al., 2015) and when high N fertilizers are used (Blevins et al., 1983). In relation to this, the results of our meta-analyses also indicated that although there was a negative relationship between the earthworms' response ratio and soil pH, they responded significantly more positively to RT operations in the most acidic soils category (pH < 5.5). It is generally assumed that earthworms can withstand strong acidic conditions (pH < 4; Bouché, 1972), with some species being described as eurytopic (e.g. *A. caliginosa*; Rätty, 2004), but their burrowing activities will greatly increase at pH values above 5.4 (Auclerc et al., 2011). On the other hand, it is known that soils with high clay and OM content also have a greater cation exchange capacity than sandy soils (Bot & Benites, 2005), as a result of clay and humus having electrostatic surface charges that attract and hold ions. This improves nutrient availability for plants and soil organisms, including earthworms and a significant positive relationship has been previously found between CEC and earthworm biomass (Reich et al., 2005). Together, these findings imply that OM accumulation and the chemical bonding of organic substrates onto clay particles clearly benefit earthworm populations, especially in soils with low carbon contents and low pH buffering capacities.

4.3 | Effects of reducing tillage intensity on taxonomic richness, age structure and functional groupings

Besides abundance and biomass, the structure of the earthworm communities can also be profoundly altered by soil cultivation (Edwards, 1983). However, while some authors have not detected any significant changes in earthworm species diversity in response to soil management (e.g. Gerard & Hay, 1979; Reddy et al., 1997), others have reported a drastic reduction in the taxonomic richness in tilled soils. For instance, Curry et al. (2002) observed a decline in species richness from 9 to 1 species after intensive destoning and

cultivation for a potato crop. Some differentiated effects, on species or ecological groups, have been reported consistently; for example, the bigger-sized worms (anecics), such as *L. terrestris* and *Aporrectodea longa*, were more sensitive to tillage than the shallow burrowing and small endogeic species such as *Allolobophora chlorotica*, *A. caliginosa* and *A. icterica* (Edwards & Lofty, 1982; Wyss, Glasstetter, & Kretzschmar, 1992). Our global meta-analysis presents the first comprehensive, quantitative review of the responses of earthworm species and the three ecological groups to RT practices.

Many agronomically or tillage-focussed studies report total earthworm numbers (and less frequently, biomass) as one of several commonly measured indicators of the biological effects of tillage practices. Our meta-analysis provides compelling evidence for the significantly different responses to tillage by ecological groups and also individual species of earthworms (Figure 10a,c). For a full understanding of tillage effects on earthworms and their functions, it is therefore imperative that species (or ecological groups) are reported and considered separately, taking account of their biology, habitat requirements, survival strategies and so on.

One common survival strategy exhibited by earthworms during adverse environmental conditions is to move down to deeper layers and enter into a resting stage (by emptying their gut and coiling up into a tight ball inside an aestivation chamber which has been made previously by mixing casts and mucus; Lee, 1985). By disturbing the soil (e.g. by inversion tillage) during inactive periods of the year (late autumn, early spring) and exposing the earthworms that have entered into this inactive stage to the surface, where they can be easily predated, can cause severe reductions in their populations (Curry et al., 2002). The most likely species to be affected by these disturbances are surface dwellers (i.e. belonging to the epigeic ecological group) and the anecic worms that build vertical burrows open to the surface where they feed and cast, whereas the small endogeics living in the mineral horizons exhibit fewer alterations in their populations.

Furthermore, in the case of well-studied anecic species, such as *L. terrestris*, there is evidence suggesting that their burrows are permanent or semipermanent structures that can be inherited by their offspring (Butt, Nuutinen, & Siren, 2003; Grigoropoulou, Butt, & Lowe, 2008). This low mobility might also explain why this species showed the greatest positive effect from reducing tillage operations. Indeed, our meta-analyses showed very clearly that *L. terrestris* exhibited the strongest positive response to RT, by increasing the average number of their populations by about 124% compared to the overall mean.

In the case of other anecic species reported in the literature and included in our meta-analyses, such as *A. longa* and *A. trapezoides*, although they also benefited from reducing tillage intensity, the magnitude of their responses was less marked. Therefore, species identity plays a determining role in the overall response of earthworm populations to tillage and can explain a good number of inconsistent results observed in the literature, where the communities in these cultivated soils were mainly dominated by these species (Hubbard et al., 1999; Johnson-Maynard, Umiker, & Guy, 2007). However, as

is also shown in our meta-analyses, the earthworm responses to reduced forms of tillage were modulated by their specific sensitivity to tillage techniques (with DSL having the most detrimental effects on the recovery of all investigated species) and to the presence/absence of harvest residues on the soil surface.

Long-term recover of earthworm populations after tillage is also influenced by survival of their offspring (cocoons and juveniles). Unfortunately, the majority of results reported in the literature were based on total or adult individuals, in most cases because adults are easier to identify. However, it is well known that earthworm populations mainly consist of immature worms, with some reports indicating they can make up to 76%–90% of the population (Dominguez & Bedano, 2016; Marwitz et al., 2012), and that they are extremely sensitive to tillage (Ulrich et al., 2010). Therefore, future research efforts should incorporate the effects of tillage operations on young worms. Juvenile earthworms can occupy a different niche than adults by feeding on the surface layers irrespective of the ecological grouping (Gerard, 1967; Rundgren, 1975) and it has been observed that performing tillage operations during those periods when their numbers are high results in more severe reductions of this age group than in the adult numbers (De St. Remy & Day-Nard, 1982).

As seen before, adding supplementary food material can counteract some of the negative effects of tillage (Curry, 2004). Farmyard manures derived from livestock are rich in nitrogen and release organic material rapidly (Leroy et al., 2008) and that is why they represent preferential sites for the earthworms to lay their cocoons and for the juveniles to grow (Binet, Hallaire, & Curmi, 1997). Plant roots also provide good environments for earthworm reproduction (Gerard, 1967; Satchell, 1977); however, when the crop is harvested and soil turned over, the supply of fresh plant material is ploughed under which might then benefit the deep burrower adult worms but can compromise the survival of the newly born worms.

Taken together, these findings suggest that feeding habits, body size and burrowing activities determine the survival of earthworm species to tillage. Future research could expand the present analysis even further by analysing traits rather than species of life forms (e.g. Bokhorst et al., 2012). Importantly, the fact that our results confirmed that epigeic and, more importantly, anecic worms, are the functional groups first to disappear from tilled soils has far-reaching implications for the functioning of these agricultural systems. For instance, the absence of deep burrowers will mean that the maintenance of soil structure and drainage, the incorporation of OM down the soil profile together with the mixing of the soil will not be carried out to the same extent by the natural plough of the Earth. The lack of surface dwellers will also have negative effects on the degradation of fresh inputs of OM. In turn, the disappearance of the surface casting activities of these two important ecological groupings will profoundly affect microbial activities and overall, the recycling of nutrients and the long-term functioning of the soil. Therefore, as seen here, various forms of RT can be adopted to achieve soils with larger and functionally diverse earthworm communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank S. Schrader (Thünen Institute, Germany), M. Hoogmoed (PIRSA-SARDI, Australia) and M. Pulleman (Wageningen University, the Netherlands) for their contributions towards the initial databases. We are very grateful to R. Pommeresche (Norwegian Institute for Agricultural and Environmental Research, Norway), A.R. Ngwira (Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway), Y. Capowiez (INRA Avignon, France), S. Crittenden (Wageningen University, the Netherlands), I. Mijangos (Basque Institute of Agricultural R&D, Spain), C. Cantero-Marínez (Universitat de Lleida, Spain), M. Joschko (Leibniz-Zentrum für Agrarlandschaftsforschung, Germany), M. Poththoff (Universität Göttingen, Germany), C. Pekrun (Nürtingen-Geislingen University, Germany), A. Woźniak (University of Life Sciences Lublin, Poland), B. Madarász (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary), D. Jodaugienė (Lithuanian University of Agriculture, Lithuania), A. Berner (Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, Switzerland), T. Anken (Swiss Federal Research Station for Agricultural Economics and Engineering, Switzerland), W. Jossi and C. Maurer-Troxler (Forschungsanstalt Agroscope Reckenholz-Tänikon, Switzerland), M. Iordache (University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Banat, Moldova), C. Masín (Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Argentina), C. Bedano (Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Argentina), M. Braunack (Sugar Yield Decline Joint Venture, Australia), C. Thierfelder (CIMMYT, Zimbabwe), J. Moradi (Tarbiat Modares University, Iran) and A. Ratnadass (URP SCRiD, Madagascar) for providing earthworm data from their studies. We would also like to thank M. Birkás (Szent Istvan University, Hungary), P. László (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary), S. Tiedemann (Institut für Zuckerrübenforschung, Germany), O. Christen (University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany), D.R. Lapen (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), E. Blackman (North Carolina State University, USA), J. Simonsen (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, USA), D. Espinosa (Colegio de Postgraduados, Mexico), E.P. Marín (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), A. Feijoo (Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira, Colombia), A. Domínguez (National University of Río Cuarto, Argentina), V. Boguzas (Lithuanian University of Agriculture, Lithuania), S. Hansen (Norwegian Institute for Agricultural and Environmental Research, Norway), P. Bescansa (Universidad Pública de Navarra, Spain) and C. Garbisu (Basque Institute of Agricultural R&D, Spain) for supplying additional information about the field sites, soils and the experimental treatments included in their publications. We are also very grateful to E. Rueda (Universidad de Vigo, Spain) for guidance when grouping data on soil properties and to S. Jeffery (Harper Adams University, UK) for his valuable advice in relation to meta-analysis. We are indebted to Mrs. J. Coward (librarian at CEH Lancaster, UK) for the difficult task of obtaining a good number of elusive references dealing with tillage and earthworms. We thank L. Brussaard (Wageningen University, the Netherlands) for his support and the C.T. de Wit Graduate School for Production Ecology and Resource Conservation (PE & RC) of Wageningen University for a short-term Visiting Scientist grant awarded to M.J.I. Briones in 2012.

REFERENCES

- Aslam, T., Choudhary, M. A., & Saggar, S. (1999). Tillage impacts on soil microbial biomass C, N and P, earthworms and agronomy after two years of cropping following permanent pasture in New Zealand. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 51, 103–111.
- Auclerc, A., Nahmani, J. Y., Huguier, P., Capowiez, Y., Aran, D., & Guérolf, F. (2011). Adapting ecotoxicological tests based on earthworm behavior to assess the potential effectiveness of forest soil liming. *Pedobiologia*, 54S(Suppl.), S63–S68.
- Ayuke, F. O., Pulleman, M. M., Vanlauwe, B., de Goede, R. G. M., Six, J., Csuzdi, C., & Brussaard, L. (2011). Agricultural management affects earthworm and termite diversity across humid to semi-arid tropical zones. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 140, 148–154.
- Baker, G. H., Carter, P. J., Curry, J. P., Cultren, O., & Beck, A. (1998). Clay content of soil and its influence on the abundance of *Aporrectodea trapezoides* Dugès (Lumbricidae). *Applied Soil Ecology*, 9, 333–337.
- Bakken, A. K., Brandsæter, L. O., Eltun, R., Hansen, S., Mangerud, K., Pommeresche, R., & Riley, H. (2009). Effect of tractor weight, depth of ploughing and wheel placement during ploughing in an organic cereal rotation on contrasting soils. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 103, 433–441.
- Bamminger, C., Zaiser, N., Zinsler, P., Lamers, M., Kammann, C., & Marhan, S. (2014). Effects of biochar, earthworms, and litter addition on soil microbial activity and abundance in a temperate agricultural soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 50, 1189–1200.
- Barley, K. P. (1959). The influence of earthworms on soil fertility. I. Earthworm populations found in agricultural land near Adelaide. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 10, 171–178.
- Barnes, B. T., & Ellis, F. B. (1979). Effects of different methods of cultivation and direct drilling, and disposal of straw residues, on populations of earthworms. *Journal of Soil Science*, 30, 669–679.
- Berner, A., Hildermann, I., Fliessbach, A., Pfiffner, L., Niggli, U., & Mäder, P. (2008). Crop yield and soil fertility response to reduced tillage under organic management. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 101, 89–96.
- Betrand, M., Barot, S., Blouin, M., Whalen, J., de Oliveira, T., & Roger-Estrade, J. (2015). Earthworm services for cropping systems. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 35, 553–567.
- Binet, F., Hallaire, V., & Curmi, P. (1997). Agricultural practices and the spatial distribution of earthworms in maize fields. Relationships between earthworm abundance, maize plants and soil compaction. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 577–583.
- Birkas, M., Bottlik, L., Stingli, A., Gyuricza, C., & Jolánkai, M. (2010). Effect of soil physical state on the earthworms in Hungary. *Applied and Environmental Soil Science*, 2010, 830853. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/830853>
- Birkas, M., Jolánkai, M., Gyuricza, C., & Percze, A. (2004). Tillage effects on compaction, earthworms and other soil quality indicators in Hungary. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 78, 185–196.
- Bittman, S., & Kowalenko, C. G. (2004). *Advanced silage corn management*. Agassiz: Pacific Field Corn Association.
- Blanchet, G., Gavazov, K., Bragazza, L., & Sokrat, S. (2016). Responses of soil properties and crop yields to different inorganic and organic amendments in a Swiss conventional farming system. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 230, 116–126.
- Blevins, R. L., Smith, M. S., Thomas, G. W., & Frye, W. W. (1983). Influence of conservation tillage on soil properties. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 38, 301–305.
- Boguzas, V., Kairyte, A., & Jodaugienė, D. (2010). Soil physical properties and earthworms as affected by soil tillage systems, straw and green manure management. *Žemdirbystė – Agriculture*, 97, 3–14.
- Bokhorst, S., Phoenix, G. K., Bjerke, J. W., Callaghan, T. V., Huyer-Brugman, F., & Berg, M. P. (2012). Extreme winter warming events more negatively impact small rather than large soil fauna: Shift in community composition explained by traits not taxa. *Global Change Biology*, 18, 1152–1162.

- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis* (Chapter 20 Meta-Regression). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386.ch20>
- Boström, U. (1988). *Ecology of earthworms in Arable Land. Population dynamics and activity in four cropping systems*. Report 34. Department of Ecology and Environmental Research, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.
- Boström, U. (1995). Earthworm populations (Lumbricidae) in ploughed and undisturbed leys. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 35, 125–133.
- Bot, A., & Benites, J. (2005). *The Importance of soil organic matter: Key to drought-resistant soil and sustained food production* (FAO Soils Bulletins 80). Rome: FAO. 94 pp.
- Bouché, M. B. (1972). *Lombriens de France. Ecologie et systematique*. (pp. 671). Paris: Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique.
- Bouché, M. B. (1977). Stratégies lombriciennes. In U. Lohm & T. Persson (Eds.), *Soil organisms as components of ecosystems*, Vol 25 (pp. 122–132). Stockholm, Sweden: Ecological Bulletin.
- Boudiaf, N. K. M., Metheri, M. S., Mouas, B. S., & Derridj, A. (2015). Climate impact on the abundance of soil macroinvertebrates in Algerian olive orchards. *Agriculture and Food*, 3, 320–324.
- Briones, M. J. I. (2014). Soil fauna and soil functions: A jigsaw puzzle. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 2, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2014.00007>
- Briones, M. J. I., & Bol, R. (2003). Natural abundance of ^{13}C and ^{15}N in earthworms from different cropping treatments. *Pedobiologia*, 47, 560–567. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-4056\(04\)70238-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-4056(04)70238-3)
- Brito-Vega, H., Espinosa-Victoria, D., Fragoso, C., Mendoza, D., De la Cruz Landero, N., & Alderete-Chavez, A. (2009). Soil organic matter particle and presence of earthworm under different tillage systems. *Journal of Biological Sciences*, 9, 180–183.
- Brussaard, L., Aanen, D. K., Briones, M. J. I., Decaëns, T., De Deyn, G. B., Fayle, T. M., ... Nobre, T. (2012). Biogeography and phylogenetic community structure of soil invertebrate ecosystem engineers. In D. H. Wall, R. D. Bardgett, V. Behan-Pelletier, J. E. Herrick, T. H. Jones, K. Ritz, J. Six, D. R. Strong, & W. H. van der Putten (Eds.), *Soil ecology and ecosystem services* (pp. 201–232). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buckerfield, J. C., & Wiseman, D. (1997). Earthworm populations recover after potato cropping. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 609–612.
- Butt, K. R., Nuutinen, V., & Siren, T. (2003). Resource distribution and surface activity of adult *Lumbricus terrestris* L. in an experimental system. *Pedobiologia*, 47, 548–553.
- Capowiez, Y., Cadoux, S., Bouchand, P., Roger-Estrade, J., Richard, G., & Boizard, H. (2009). Experimental evidence for the role of earthworms in compacted soil regeneration based on field observations and results from a semi-field experiment. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 41, 711–717.
- Capowiez, Y., Cadoux, S., Bouchant, P., Ruy, S., Roger-Estrade, J., Richard, G., & Boizard, H. (2009). The effect of tillage type and cropping system on earthworm communities, macroporosity and water infiltration. *Soil Tillage and Research*, 105, 209–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2009.09.002>
- Carter, M. R., Sanderson, J. B., Ivany, J. A., & White, R. P. (2002). Influence of rotation and tillage on forage maize productivity, weed species, and soil quality of a fine sandy loam in the cool-humid climate of Atlantic Canada. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 67, 85–98.
- Chan, K. Y. (2001). An overview of some tillage impacts on earthworm population abundance and diversity – implications for functioning in soils. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 57, 179–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987\(00\)00173-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987(00)00173-2)
- Clapperton, M. J. (1999). Tillage practices, and temperature and moisture interactions affect earthworm populations and species composition. *Pedobiologia*, 43, 658–665.
- Clapperton, M. J., Miller, J. J., Larney, F. J., & Lindwall, C. W. (1997). Earthworm populations as affected by long-term tillage practices in southern, Alberta, Canada. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 631–633.
- Conyers, M., Liu, D. L., Kirkegaard, J., Orgill, S., Oates, A., Li, G., ... Kirkby, C. (2015). A review of organic carbon accumulation in soils within the agricultural context of southern New South Wales, Australia. *Field Crops Research*, 184, 177–182.
- Crittenden, S. J., Eswaramurthy, T., de Goede, R. G. M., Brussaard, L., & Pulleman, M. M. (2014). Effect of tillage on earthworms over short- and medium-term in conventional and organic farming. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 83, 140–148.
- Cuendet, C. (1983). Predation on earthworms by the black-headed gull (*Larus ribibundus* L.). In J. E. Satchell (Ed.), *Earthworm ecology. From Darwin to vermiculture* (pp. 415–424). London: Chapman and Hall.
- Curry, J. P. (2004). Factors affecting the abundance of earthworms in soils. In C. A. Edwards (Ed.), *Earthworm ecology* (pp. 91–113). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Curry, J. P., Byrne, D., & Schmidt, O. (2002). Intensive cultivation can drastically reduce earthworm populations in arable land. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 38, 127–130.
- Curtis, P. S., Mengersen, K., Lajeunesse, M. J., Rothstein, H. R., & Stewart, G. (2013). Extraction and critical appraisal of data. In J. Koričeva, & J. Gurevitch (Eds.), *Handbook of meta-analysis in ecology and evolution* (pp. 52–60). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Darwin, C. R. (1881). *The formation of vegetable mould through the action of worms*. London: John Murray.
- Datta, S., Singh, J., Singh, S., & Singh, J. (2016). Earthworms, pesticides and sustainable agriculture: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23, 8227–8243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-6375-0>
- De St. Remy, E. A., & Day-Nard, T. B. (1982). Effects of tillage methods on earthworm populations in monoculture corn. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science*, 62, 699–703.
- Derpsch, R., Friedrich, T., Kassam, A., & Hongwen, L. (2010). Current status of adoption of no-till farming in the world and some of its main benefits. *International Journal of Agricultural and Biological Engineering*, 3, 1–25.
- D'Hose, T., Ruyschaert, G., Viaene, N., Debode, J., Vanden Nest, T., Van Vaerenbergh, J., ... Vandecasteele, B. (2016). Farm compost amendment and non-inversion tillage improve soil quality without increasing the risk for N and P leaching. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 225, 126–139.
- Dominguez, A., & Bedano, J. C. (2016). Earthworm and Enchytraeid co-occurrence pattern in organic and conventional farming: Consequences for ecosystem engineering. *Soil Science*, 181, 148–156.
- Doube, B. M., & Schmidt, O. (1997). Can the abundance or activity of soil macrofauna be used to indicate the biological health of soils? In C. E. Pankhurst, B. M. Doube, & V. V. S. R. Gupta (Eds.), *Biological indicators of soil health* (pp. 265–295). Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Edwards, C. A. (1983). Earthworm ecology in cultivated soils. In J. E. Satchell (Ed.), *Earthworm ecology: From Darwin to vermiculture* (pp. 123–137). London: Chapman & Hall.
- Edwards, C. A., & Bohlen, P. J. (1996). *Biology and ecology of earthworms*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Edwards, C. A., & Lofty, J. R. (1982). The effects of direct drilling and minimal cultivation on earthworm populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 19, 723–734.
- El Titi, A. (2003). *Soil tillage in agroecosystems*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Ellis, F. B., Elliott, J. G., Barnes, B. T., & Howse, K. R. (1977). Comparison of direct drilling, reduced cultivation and ploughing on the growth of cereals. 2. Spring barley on a sandy loam soil; soil physical conditions and root growth. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 89, 631–642.
- Emmerling, C. (2001). Response of earthworm communities to different types of soil tillage. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 17, 91–96.

- Errouissi, F., Moussa-Machraoui, S. B., Ben-Hammouda, M., & Nouira, S. (2011). Soil invertebrates in durum wheat (*Triticum durum* L.) cropping system under Mediterranean semi arid conditions: A comparison between conventional and no-tillage management. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 112, 122–132.
- Fortune, T., Kennedy, T., Mitchell, B., & Dunne, B. (2003). *Reduced cultivations – Agronomic and environmental aspects*. Teagasc National Tillage Conference Proceedings, Carlow, Ireland, 70–82.
- Fortune, T., Kennedy, T., Mitchell, B., Dunne, B., Murphy, K., Connery, J., & Grace, J. (2005). *Reduced cultivations – Update from Oak Park experiments*. In: Proceedings of the National Tillage Conference 2005 (pp. 18–34). Teagasc, Oak Park, Carlow, Ireland.
- Fragoso, C., & Lavelle, P. (1992). Earthworm communities of tropical rain forests. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 24, 1397–1408.
- Fusilero, M. A., Mangubat, J., Ragas, R. E., Baguino, N., Taya, H., & Rasco, E. (2013). Weed management systems and other factors affecting the earthworm population in a banana plantation. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 56, 89–94.
- Gajri, P. R., Arora, V. K., & Prihar, S. S. (2002). *Tillage for sustainable cropping*. New York: Food Products Press.
- García-Pérez, J. A., Alarcón, E., Hernández, Y., & Hernández, C. (2016). Impact of litter contaminated with glyphosate-based herbicide on the performance of *Pontosclex corethrurus*, soil phosphatase activities and soil pH. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 104, 31–41.
- García-Pérez, J. A., Alarcón-Gutiérrez, E., Perroni, Y., & Barois, I. (2014). Earthworm communities and soil properties in shaded coffee plantations with and without application of glyphosate. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 83, 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2013.09.006>
- García-Torres, T., Giuffré, L., Romaniuk, R., Ríos, R. P., & Pagano, E. A. (2014). Exposure assessment to glyphosate of two species of annelids. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 93, 209–214.
- Gaupp-Berghausen, M., Hofer, M., Rewald, B., & Zaller, J. G. (2015). Glyphosate-based herbicides reduce the activity and reproduction of earthworms and lead to increased soil nutrient concentrations. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 12886. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep12886>
- Gerard, B. M. (1967). Factors affecting earthworms in pastures. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 36, 235–252.
- Gerard, B. M., & Hay, R. K. M. (1979). The effect on earthworms of ploughing, tined cultivation, direct drilling and nitrogen in a barley monoculture system. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 93, 147–155.
- Gillman, G. P. (1985). Influence of organic matter and phosphate content on the point of zero charge of variable charge components in oxidic soils. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*, 23, 643–646.
- Givaudan, N., Binet, F., Le Bot, B., & Wiegand, C. (2014). Earthworm tolerance to residual agricultural pesticide contamination: Field and experimental assessment of detoxification capabilities. *Environmental Pollution*, 192, 9–18.
- Grigoropoulou, N., Butt, K. R., & Lowe, C. N. (2008). Effects of adult *Lumbricus terrestris* on cocoons and hatchlings in Evans' boxes. *Pedobiologia*, 51, 343–349.
- Guo, L. B., & Gifford, R. M. (2002). Soil carbon stocks and land use change: A meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 8, 345–360.
- Hackenberger, D. K., & Hackenberger, B. K. (2014). Earthworm community structure in grassland habitats differentiated by climate type during two consecutive seasons. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 61, 27–34.
- Haukka, J. (1988). Effect of various cultivation methods on earthworm biomasses and communities on different soil types. *Annales Agricolurae Fenniae*, 27, 263–269.
- Haynes, R. J., & Mokolobate, M. S. (2001). Amelioration of Al toxicity and P deficiency in acid soils by additions of organic residues: A critical review of the phenomenon and the mechanisms involved. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 59, 47–63.
- Hedges, L. V., Gurevitch, J., & Curtis, P. S. (1999). The meta-analysis of response ratios in experimental ecology. *Ecology*, 80, 1150–1156.
- Hendrix, P. F., Muller, B. R., Bruce, R. R., Langdale, G. W., & Parmelee, R. W. (1992). Abundance and distribution of earthworms in relation to landscape factors on the Georgia piedmont, U.S.A. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 24, 1357–1361.
- Henke, W. (1994). Einfluß der Bodenbearbeitung auf die Lumbricidenpopulation und deren Aktivität in verschiedenen Ackerböden. *Mitteilungen aus dem Hamburgischen Zoologischen Museum und Institut*, 89, 89–100. [In German with English summary].
- Herrmann, K. M., & Weaver, L. M. (1999). The shikimate pathway. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*, 50, 473–503.
- Hubbard, V. C., Jordan, D., & Stecker, J. A. (1999). Earthworm response to rotation and tillage in a Missouri claypan soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 29, 343–347.
- Hutcheon, J. A., Iles, D. R., & Kendall, D. A. (2001). Earthworm populations in conventional and integrated farming systems in the LIFE Project (SW England) in 1990–2000. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 139, 361–372.
- Ivask, M., Kuu, A., & Sizov, E. (2007). Abundance of earthworm species in Estonian arable soils. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 43, S39–S42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2007.08.006>
- Jeffery, S., Verheijen, F. G. A., van der Velde, M., & Bastos, A. C. (2011). A quantitative review of the effects of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 144, 175–187.
- Jodaugienė, D., Raudonius, S., Špokienė, N., & Trečiokas, K. (2005). The influence of ploughing and ploughless soil tillage on soil properties in winter wheat crop. *Agronomijas Vestis – Latvian Journal of Agronomy*, 8, 200–205.
- Johnson-Maynard, J. L., Umiker, K. J., & Guy, S. O. (2007). Earthworm dynamics and soil physical properties in the first three years of no-till management. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 94, 338–345.
- Jordan, D., Gantzer, C. J., Brown, J. R., Stecker, J. A., Hubbard, V. C., & Zhu, J. (1997). *Earthworms in a Missouri claypan soil*. Final Report (Project 94–2) (p. 41). Jefferson City, Missouri: Department of Natural Resources.
- Jordan, D., Stecker, J. A., Cacio-Hubbard, V. N., Li, F., Gantzer, C. J., & Brown, J. R. (1997). Earthworm activity in no-tillage and conventional tillage systems in Missouri soils: A preliminary study. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 489–491. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(96\)00038-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(96)00038-7)
- Joschko, M., Barkusky, D., Rogasik, J., Fox, C. A., Rogasik, H., Gellert, R., ... Gerlach, F. (2012). On-farm study of reduced tillage on sandy soil: Effects on soil organic carbon dynamic and earthworm abundance. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science*, 58, S252–S260.
- Joschko, M., Gebbers, R., Barkusky, D., Rogasik, J., Höhn, W., Hierold, W., ... Timmer, J. (2009). Location-dependency of earthworm response to reduced tillage on sandy soil. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 102, 55–66.
- Kanianska, R., Jad'ud'ová, J., Makovniková, J., & Kizeková, M. (2016). Assessment of relationships between earthworms and soil abiotic and biotic factors as a tool in sustainable agriculture. *Sustainability*, 8, 906. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8090906>
- Karlen, D. L., Wollenhaupt, N. C., Erbach, D. C., Berry, E. C., Swan, J. B., Eash, N. S., & Jordahl, J. L. (1994). Long-term tillage effects on soil quality. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 32, 313–327.
- Kassam, A., Friedrich, T., Shaxson, F., & Pretty, J. (2009). The spread of conservation agriculture: Justification, sustainability and uptake. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 7, 292–320.
- Kennedy, T. F., Connery, J., Fortune, T., Forristal, D., & Grant, J. (2013). A comparison of the effects of minimum-till and conventional-till methods, with and without straw incorporation, on slugs, slug damage, earthworms and carabid beetles in autumn-sown cereals. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 151, 605–629.

- Kibet, L. C., Blanco-Canqui, H., & Jasa, P. (2016). Long-term tillage impacts on soil organic matter components and related properties on a Typic Argiudoll. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 155, 78–84.
- Kladivko, E. J., Akhouri, N. M., & Weesies, G. (1997). Earthworm populations and species distributions under no-till and conventional tillage in Indiana and Illinois. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 613–615.
- Köppen, W. (1923). *Die Klimate der Erde*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Köppen, W. (1931). *Die Klimate der Erde. Grundriss der Klimakunde*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kouwenhoven, J. K., Perdok, U. D., Boer, J., & Oomen, G. J. M. (2002). Soil management by shallow mouldboard ploughing in The Netherlands. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 65, 125–139.
- Krabbe, E. L., Driemeyer, D. J., Antonioli, Z. I., & Giracca, E. M. N. (1993). Avaliação populacional de oligoquetas e características físicas do solo em diferentes sistemas de cultivo. *Ciência Rural*, 23, 21–28. [In Portuguese with English summary].
- Krabbe, E. L., Driemeyer, D. J., Antonioli, Z. I., & Giracca, E. M. N. (1994). Efeitos de diferentes sistemas de cultivos sobre a população de oligoquetas e características físicas do solo. *Ciência Rural*, 24, 49–53. [In Portuguese with English summary].
- Lal, R. (2013). Enhancing ecosystem services with no-till. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 28, 102–114.
- László, P. (2007). *Adirektvetés és a Bakhátas Vetési és Művelési Rendszer Hatása a Talaj Fizikai és Biológiai Állapotára*. PhD Thesis, Doktori értekezés, Gödöllő, Hungary. [In Hungarian]
- Lavelle, P., & Spain, A. V. (2001). *Soil ecology*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Scientific. 678 pp.
- Lee, K. E. (1985). *Earthworms: Their ecology and relationships with soils and land use*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Leroy, B. L. M., Schmidt, O., Van den Bossche, A., Reheul, D., & Moens, M. (2008). Earthworm population dynamics as influenced by the quality of exogenous organic matter. *Pedobiologia*, 52, 139–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedobi.2008.07.001>
- Low, A. J. (1972). The effect of cultivation on the structure and other physical characteristics of grassland and arable soils (1945–1970). *Journal of Soil Science*, 23, 363–380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.1972.tb01668.x>
- Lugato, E., Bampa, F., Panagos, P., Montanarella, L., & Jones, A. (2014). Potential carbon sequestration of European arable soils estimated by modelling a comprehensive set of management practices. *Global Change Biology*, 20, 3557–3567.
- Mallet, J. B., Lang, P. M., & Arathoon, A. J. (1987). Changes in a Doveton clay loam after 12 years of direct drill maize production. *South African Journal of Plant and Soil*, 4, 188–192.
- Marchão, R. L., Lavelle, P., Celini, L., Balbino, L. C., Vilela, L., & Becquer, T. (2009). Soil macrofauna under integrated crop-livestock systems in a Brazilian Cerrado Ferralsol. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira*, 44, 1011–1020.
- Marinissen, J. C. Y. (1992). Population dynamics of earthworms in a silt loam soil under conventional and “integrated” arable farming during two years with different weather patterns. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 24, 1647–1654.
- Marwitz, A., Ladewig, E., & Märländer, B. (2012). Impact of herbicide application intensity in relation to environment and tillage on earthworm population in sugar beet in Germany. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 39, 25–34.
- McAuley, L., Pham, B., Tugwell, P., & Moher, D. (2000). Does the inclusion of grey literature influence estimates of intervention effectiveness reported in meta-analyses? *Lancet*, 356, 1228–1231.
- Meteorological Office (1982). *Tables of temperature, relative humidity, precipitation and sunshine for the world. Part III. Europe and the Azores*. London: Meteorological Office.
- Miura, F., Nakamoto, T., Kaneda, S., Okano, S., Nakajima, M., & Murakami, T. (2008). Dynamics of soil biota at different depths under two contrasting tillage practices. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 40, 406–414.
- Moron-Rios, A., Rodriguez, M. A., Perez-Camacho, L., & Rebollo, S. (2010). Effects of seasonal grazing and precipitation regime on the soil macroinvertebrates of a Mediterranean old-field. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, 46, 91–96.
- Morris, N., Miller, P., & Froud-Williams, R. (2010). The adoption of non-inversion tillage systems in the United Kingdom and the agronomic impact on soil, crops and the environment: A review. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 108, 1–15.
- Mubarak, A. R., Elshami, O. M. E., & Azhari, A. A. (2005). Long- and short-term effects of cultivation on properties of a Vertisol under sugarcane plantation. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 84, 1–6.
- Müller, M. J. (1982). *Selected climatic data for a global set of standard stations for vegetation science*. The Hague: Dr W Junk Publishers.
- Nachtergaele, F., vanVelthuisen, H., Verelst, L., Batjes, N., Dijkshoorn, K., van Engelen, V., ... Wiberg, D. (2008). *Harmonized world soil database (version 1.0)*. Rome, Italy: FAO and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria.
- Najar, I. A., & Khan, A. B. (2011). Earthworm communities of Kashmir Valley, India. *Tropical Ecology*, 52, 151–162.
- Nieminen, M., Ketoja, E., Mikola, E., Terhivuo, J., Sirén, T., & Nuutinen, V. (2011). Local land use effects and regional environmental limits on earthworm communities in Finnish arable landscapes. *Ecological Applications*, 21, 3162–3177.
- Parmelee, R. W., Beare, M. H., Cheng, W., Hendrix, P. F., Rider, S. J., Crossley, D. A., & Coleman, D. C. (1990). Earthworms and enchytraeids in conventional and no-tillage agroecosystems: A biocide approach to assess their role in organic matter breakdown. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 10, 1–10.
- Parvin, N., Parvage, M. M., & Etana, A. (2014). Effect of mouldboard ploughing and shallow tillage on sub-soil physical properties and crop performance. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 60, 38–44.
- Pekrun, C., Schneider, N., Wüst, C., Jaus, F., & Claupein, W. (2003). Einfluss reduzierter Bodenbearbeitung auf Ertragsbildung, Unkrautdynamik und Regenwurmpopulationen im Ökologischen Landbau. In B. Freyer (Ed.), *Ökologischer Landbau der Zukunft. Beiträge zur 7. Wissenschafts-tagung zum Ökologischen Landbau* (pp. 21–24). Vienna: Universität für Bodenkultur. [In German]
- Petersen, H., & Luxton, M. (1982). A comparative analysis of soil fauna populations and their role in decomposition processes. *Oikos*, 39, 288–388.
- Piccoli, I., Chiarini, F., Carletti, P., Furlan, L., Lazzaro, B., Nardi, S., ... Morari, F. (2016). Disentangling the effects of conservation agriculture practices on the vertical distribution of soil organic carbon. Evidence of poor carbon sequestration in North-Eastern Italy. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 230, 68–78.
- Pommeresche, R., & Loes, A.-K. (2009). Soil quality indicator response to tillage and residue management on semi-arid Mediterranean cropland. *Dynamic Soil, Dynamic Plant*, 3, 129–142.
- Potthoff, M. (1999). *Synchronisation des Stoffkreislaufs durch Förderung bodenbiologischer Prozesse im Ackerbau*. PhD Thesis, Göttingen University, Cuvillier Verlag Göttingen, Germany, ISBN 3-89712-666-4.
- Potthoff, M., & Beese, F. (1998). Regenwurmgesellschaften in Ackerböden des integriert extensivierten Landbaus – Aspekte von Bodenschutz- und Wasserschutzmaßnahmen. *Venhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Ökologie*, 28, 545–550.
- Radford, B. J., Key, A. J., Robertson, L. N., & Thomas, G. A. (1995). Conservation tillage increases soil water storage, soil animal populations, grain yield, and response to fertiliser in the semi-arid subtropics. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 35, 223–232.
- Radford, B. J., Wilson-Rummenie, A. C., Simpson, G. B., Bell, K. L., & Ferguson, M. A. (2001). Compacted soil affects soil macrofauna populations in a semi-arid environment in central Queensland. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 33, 1869–1872.

- Ramos, M., Nacci, S., & Pla, I. (2003). Effect of raindrop impact and its relationship with aggregate stability to different disaggregation forces. *Catena*, 53, 365–376.
- Rätty, M. (2004). Growth of *Lumbricus terrestris* and *Aporrectodea caliginosa* in an acid forest soil, and their effects on enchytraeid populations and soil properties. *Pedobiologia*, 48, 321–328.
- Reddy, M. V., Reddy, V. R., Balashouri, P., Kumar, V. P. K., Cogle, A. L., Yule, D. F., & Babu, M. (1997). Responses of earthworm abundance and production of surface casts and their physico-chemical properties to soil management in relation to those of an undisturbed area on a semi-arid tropical alfisol. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 617–620.
- Redmond, C. T., Kesheimer, A., & Potter, D. A. (2014). Earthworm community composition, seasonal population structure, and casting activity on Kentucky golf courses. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 75, 116–123.
- Reeleder, R. D., Miller, J. J., Ball Coelho, B. R., & Roy, R. C. (2006). Impacts of tillage, cover crop, and nitrogen on populations of earthworms, microarthropods, and soil fungi in a cultivated fragile soil. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 33, 243–257.
- Reich, P. B., Oleksyn, J., Modrzyński, J., Hobbie, S. E., Eissenstat, D. M., Chorover, J., ... Tjoelker, M. G. (2005). Linking litter calcium, earthworms and soil properties: A common garden test with 14 tree species. *Ecology Letters*, 8, 811–818.
- Rice, C. W. (2002). Organic matter and nutrient dynamics. In R. Lal (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of soil science* (pp. 925–928). New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.
- Riley, H., & Ekeberg, E. (1998). Effects of depth and time of ploughing on yields of spring cereals and potatoes and on soil properties of a morainic loam soil. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B — Soil and Plant Science*, 48, 193–200.
- Riley, H., Pommeresche, R., Eltun, R., Hansen, S., & Korsæth, A. (2008). Soil structure, organic matter and earthworm activity in a comparison of cropping systems with contrasting tillage, rotations, fertilizer levels and manure use. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 124, 275–284.
- Roarty, S., & Schmidt, O. (2013). Permanent and new arable field margins support large earthworm communities but do not increase in-field populations. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 170, 45–55.
- Rosas-Medina, M. A., de Leon-Gonzalez, F., Flores-Macias, A., Payan-Zelaya, F., Borderas-Tordesillas, F., Gutierrez-Rodriguez, F., & Frago-Gonzalez, C. (2010). Effect of tillage, sampling date and soil depth on earthworm population on maize monoculture with continuous stover restitutions. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 108, 37–42.
- Rosenberg, M. S., Adams, D. C., & Gurevitch, J. (1997). *MetaWin: Statistical software for meta-analysis with resampling tests. ver. 1.0*. Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates.
- Rosenberg, M. S., Adams, D. C., & Gurevitch, J. (2000). *MetaWin statistical software for meta-analysis, version 2*. Department of Ecology and Evolution, State University of New York at Stony Brook. Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates, Inc.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Rothstein, H., Sutton, A., & Borenstein, M. (2005). *Publication bias in MA: Prevention assessment and adjustments*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Rovira, A. D., Smettem, K. R. J., & Lee, K. E. (1987). Effect of rotation and conservation tillage on earthworms in a red-brown earth under wheat. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 38, 829–834.
- Rundgren, S. (1975). Vertical distribution of lumbricids in southern Sweden. *Oikos*, 26, 299–306.
- Rutgers, M., Orgiazzi, A., Gardi, C., Römbke, J., Jänsch, S., Keith, A. M., ... de Zwart, D. (2016). Mapping earthworm communities in Europe. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 97, 98–111.
- Satchell, J. E. (1977). Lumbricidae. In A. Burges, & F. Raw (Eds.), *Soil biology*, 3rd ed. (pp. 259–322). London: Academic Press.
- Schirrmann, M., Joschko, M., Gebbers, R., Kramer, E., Zörner, M., Barkusky, D., & Timmer, J. (2016). Proximal soil sensing – A contribution for species habitat distribution modelling of earthworms in agricultural soils? *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0158271. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158271>
- Schmidt, O., Clements, R. O., & Donaldson, G. (2003). Why do cereal-legume intercrops support large earthworm populations?. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 22, 181–190.
- Severon, T., Joschko, M., Barkusky, D., & Graefe, U. (2012). The impact of conventional and reduced tillage on the Enchytraeidae population in sandy soil and their correlation with plant residue and earthworms. *Landbauforschung*, 357, 45–52. (Newsletter on Enchytraeidae no. 12).
- Singh, P., Heikkinen, J., Ketoja, E., Nuutinen, V., Palojärvi, A., Sheehy, J., ... Regina, K. (2015). Tillage and crop residue management methods had minor effects on the stock and stabilization of topsoil carbon in a 30-year field experiment. *Science of the Total Environment*, 518, 337–344.
- Six, J., Ogle, S. M., Breidt, F. J., Conant, R. T., Mosier, A. R., & Paustian, K. (2004). The potential to mitigate global warming with no-tillage management is only realized when practised in the long term. *Global Change Biology*, 10, 155–160.
- Smith, P., House, J. I., Bustamante, M., Sobocká, J., Harper, R., Pan, G., ... Pugh, T. A. M. (2016). Global change pressures on soils from land use and management. *Global Change Biology*, 22, 1008–1028.
- Soane, B. D., Ball, B. C., Arvidsson, J., Basch, G., Moreno, F., & Roger-Estrade, J. (2012). No-till in northern, western and south-western Europe: A review of problems and opportunities for crop production and the environment. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 118, 66–87.
- Söchtig, W. (1992). *Wechselwirkungen zwischen der Lumbricidenfauna und unterschiedlicher mechanischer Bodenverdichtung einer Löss-Parabraunerde in Freiland und Laboruntersuchungen*. PhD Thesis, Technical University Brunswick. [In German]
- Söchtig, W., & Larink, O. (1992). Effect of soil compaction on activity and biomass of endogeic lumbricids in arable soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 24, 1595–1599.
- Spagnollo, E. (2004). *Dinâmica da Matéria Orgânica em Agroecossistemas Submetidos a Queima e Manejo dos Resíduos Culturais*. PhD thesis, UFSM, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil.
- Srimurali, S., Govindaraj, S., Kumar, S. K., & Rajendran, R. B. (2015). Distribution of organochlorine pesticides in atmospheric air of Tamilnadu, southern India. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, 12, 1957–1964.
- Stancevičius, A., Jodaugienė, D., Špokienė, N., Raudonius, S., & Trečiokas, K. (2003). Ilgamečio arimo ir beplūgio žemės dirbimo įtaka dirvožemiui ir vasarinių miežių pasėliui. *Žemdirbystė – Agriculture*, 3, 40–51. [In Lithuanian].
- Stroud, J. L., Irons, D., Watts, C. W., & Whitmore, A. P. (2016). *Lumbricus terrestris* abundance is not enhanced after three years of compost amendments on a reduced tillage wheat cultivation conversion. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 98, 282–284.
- Tan, C. S., Drury, C. F., Reynolds, W. D., Gaynor, J. D., Zhang, T. Q., & Ng, H. Y. (2002). Effect of long-term conventional tillage and no-tillage systems on soil and water quality at the field scale. *Water Science and Technology*, 46, 183–190.
- Tan, C. S., Drury, C. F., Sultani, M., van Wesenbeeck, I. J., Ng, H. Y., Gaynor, J. D., & Welacky, T. W. (1998). Effect of controlled drainage and tillage on soil structure and tile drainage nitrate loss at the field scale. *Water Science and Technology*, 38, 103–110.
- Tanck, B. C. B., Santos, H. R., & Dionísio, J. A. (2000). Influência de diferentes sistemas de uso e manejo do solo sobre a flutuação populacional do oligo-queta edáfico *Amyntas* spp. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo*, 24, 409–415. [In Portuguese with English summary].
- Tsiafouli, M. A., Thébault, E., Sgardelis, S. P., de Ruiter, P. C., van der Putten, W. H., Birkhofer, K., ... Hedlund, K. (2015). Intensive agriculture reduces soil biodiversity across Europe. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 973–985. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12752>

- Tummers, B. (2006). *DataThief III*. Retrieved from <http://datathief.org/>
- Ulrich, S., Tischer, S., Hofmann, B., & Christen, O. (2010). Biological soil properties in a long-term tillage trial in Germany. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, *173*, 483–489.
- van Capelle, C., Schrader, S., & Brunotte, J. (2012). Tillage-induced changes in the functional diversity of soil biota—a review with a focus on German data. *European Journal of Soil Biology*, *50*, 165–181.
- Velki, M., & Ecimovic, S. (2015). Changes in exposure temperature lead to changes in pesticide toxicity to earthworms: A preliminary study. *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, *40*, 774–784.
- von Eichhorn, H., & Tebrügge, F. (1990). Die Art der Bodenbearbeitung und ihre Folgen. *Spiegel der Forschung*, *1/90*, 27–34. [In German].
- Vršić, S. (2011). Soil erosion and earthworm population responses to soil management systems in steep-slope vineyards. *Plant, Soil and Environment*, *57*, 258–263.
- Weber, M., & Emmerling, C. (2005) Long-term effects of reduced and conservation tillage in organic farming on soil organic matter and nutrient content, and soil biological properties. In J. Heß & G. Rahmann (Eds.), *8. Wissenschaftstagung Ökologischer Landbau: Ende der Nische* (pp. 5–8). Kassel, Germany: Kassel University Press. [In German with English summary]
- Wilson-Rummenie, A. C., Radford, B. J., Robertson, L. N., Simpson, G. B., & Bell, K. L. (1999). Reduced tillage increases population density of soil macrofauna in a semi-arid environment in central Queensland. *Environmental Entomology*, *28*, 163–172.
- Wyss, E., Glasstetter, M., & Kretzschmar, A. (1992). Tillage treatments and earthworm distribution in a Swiss experimental corn field. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *24*, 1635–1639.
- Zaller, J. G., Heigl, F., Ruess, L., & Grabmaier, A. (2014). Glyphosate herbicide affects belowground interactions between earthworms and symbiotic mycorrhizal fungi in a model ecosystem. *Scientific Reports*, *4*, 5634. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep05634>
- Zhang, G. S., Chan, K. Y., Oates, A., Heenan, D. P., & Huang, G. B. (2007). Relationship between soil structure and runoff/soil loss after 24 years of conservation tillage. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *92*, 122–128.
- Zhao, X., Liu, S. L., Pu, C., Zhang, X. Q., Xue, J. F., Zhang, R., ... Chen, F. (2016). Methane and nitrous oxide emissions under no-till farming in China: A meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, *22*, 1372–1384.
- Zida, Z., Ouédraogob, E., Mandoc, A., & Stroosnijder, L. (2011). Termite and earthworm abundance and taxonomic richness under long-term conservation soil management in Saria, Burkina Faso, West Africa. *Applied Soil Ecology*, *51*, 122–129.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

How to cite this article: Briones MJJ, Schmidt O.

Conventional tillage decreases the abundance and biomass of earthworms and alters their community structure in a global meta-analysis. *Glob Change Biol.* 2017;23:4396–4419.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13744>