

Global Patterns and Controls of Nutrient Immobilization on Decomposing Cellulose in Riverine Ecosystems

David Costello, Scott Tiegs, Luz Boyero, Cristina Canhoto, Krista Capps, Michael Danger, Paul Frost, Mark Gessner, Natalie Griffiths, Halvor Halvorson, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

David Costello, Scott Tiegs, Luz Boyero, Cristina Canhoto, Krista Capps, et al.. Global Patterns and Controls of Nutrient Immobilization on Decomposing Cellulose in Riverine Ecosystems. Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 2022, 36 (3), pp.e2021GB007163. 10.1029/2021GB007163 . hal-03613046

HAL Id: hal-03613046 https://hal.science/hal-03613046v1

Submitted on 20 Dec 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Global Patterns and Controls of Nutrient Immobilization on Decomposing Cellulose in Riverine Ecosystems

David M. Costello^{1,2}*, Scott D. Tiegs³, Luz Boyero^{4,5}, Cristina Canhoto⁶, Krista A. Capps^{7,8}, 4 Michael Danger⁹, Paul C. Frost¹⁰, Mark O. Gessner^{11,12}, Natalie A. Griffiths¹³, Halvor M. 5 Halvorson¹⁴, Kevin A. Kuehn¹⁵, Amy M. Marcarelli¹⁶, Todd V. Royer¹⁷, Devan M. Mathie¹, 6 Ricardo J. Albariño¹⁸, Clay P. Arango¹⁹, Jukka Aroviita²⁰, Colden V. Baxter²¹, Brent J. 7 Bellinger²², Andreas Bruder²³, Francis J. Burdon²⁴, Marcos Callisto²⁵, Antonio Camacho²⁶, 8 Fanny Colas²⁷, Julien Cornut²⁸, Verónica Crespo-Pérez^{29,30}, Wyatt F. Cross³¹, Alison M. 9 Derry³², Michael M. Douglas³³, Arturo Elosegi⁴, Elvira de Eyto³⁴, Verónica Ferreira³⁵, 10 Carmen Ferriol³⁶, Tadeusz Fleituch³⁷, Jennifer J. Follstad Shah³⁸, André Frainer^{39,40}, Erica 11 A. Garcia⁴¹, Liliana García⁴², Pavel E. García^{43,44}, Darren P. Giling^{11,45,46}, R. Karina 12 Gonzales-Pomar⁴⁷, Manuel A. S. Graça³⁵, Hans-Peter Grossart^{11,48}, François Guérold⁹, 13 Luiz U. Hepp⁴⁹, Scott N. Higgins⁵⁰, Takuo Hishi⁵¹, Carlos Iñiguez-Armijos⁵², Tomoya 14 Iwata⁵³, Andrea E. Kirkwood⁵⁴, Aaron A. Koning⁵⁵, Sarian Kosten^{56,57}, Hjalmar Laudon⁵⁸, 15 Peter R. Leavitt⁵⁹, Aurea L. Lemes da Silva⁶⁰, Shawn J. Leroux⁶¹, Carri J. LeRoy⁶², Peter J. 16 Lisi⁶³, Frank O. Masese⁶⁴, Peter B. McIntyre⁶⁵, Brendan G. McKie⁶⁶, Adriana O. 17 Medeiros⁶⁷, Marko Miliša⁶⁸, Yo Miyake⁶⁹, Robert J. Mooney⁶³, Timo Muotka⁷⁰, Jorge 18 Nimptsch⁷¹, Riku Paavola⁷², Isabel Pardo⁴², Ivan Y. Parnikoza^{73,74}, Christopher J. 19 Patrick⁷⁵, Edwin T. H. M. Peeters⁷⁶, Jesus Pozo⁴, Brian Reid⁷⁷, John S. Richardson⁷⁸, José 20 Rincón⁷⁹, Geta Risnoveanu⁸⁰, Christopher T. Robinson²⁴, Anna C. Santamans²⁶, Gelas M. 21 Simiyu⁸¹, Agnija Skuja⁸², Jerzy Smykla³⁷, Ryan A. Sponseller⁸³, Franco Teixeira-de 22 Mello⁸⁴, Sirje Vilbaste⁸⁵, Veronica D. Villanueva¹⁸, Jackson R. Webster⁸⁶, Stefan Woelfl⁷¹, 23

24 Marguerite A. Xenopoulos¹⁰, Adam G.Yates^{87,88}, Catherine M. Yule⁸⁹, Yixin Zhang^{90,91}, and

25 Jacob A. Zwart⁹²

1

²⁶ ¹Department of Biological Sciences, Kent State University ²Environmental Science and Design

27 Research Institute, Kent State University ³Department of Biological Sciences, Oakland

²⁸ University ⁴Department of Plant Biology and Ecology, University of the Basque Country ⁵

29 Ikerbasque, Bilbao, Spain ⁶Centre for Functional Ecology, Department of Life Sciences,

- 30 University of Coimbra ⁷Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia ⁸Savannah River
- 31 Ecology Laboratory, University of Georgia ⁹LIEC-CNRS, University of Lorraine ¹⁰Department

of Biology, Trent University ¹¹Department of Experimental Limnology, Leibniz Institute of

- ³³ Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB) ¹²Department of Ecology, Berlin Institute of
- ³⁴ Technology (TU Berlin) ¹³Climate Change Science Institute and Environmental Sciences

35 Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory ¹⁴Biology Department, University of Central Arkansas

¹⁵School of Biological, Environmental and Earth Sciences, University of Southern Mississippi

¹⁶Department of Biological Sciences, Michigan Technological University ¹⁷O'Neill School of
 Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University ¹⁸INIBIOMA, Universidad Nacional

- Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University ¹⁸INIBIOMA, Universidad Nacional
 Comahue (CONICET) ¹⁹Department of Biological Sciences, Central Washington University
- ²⁰Freshwater Centre, Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) ²¹Stream Ecology Center,
- 41 Department of Biological Sciences, Idaho State University ²²Watershed Protection Department,
- 42 City of Austin TX ²³Institute of Microbiology, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of
- 43 Southern Switzerland ²⁴Department of Aquatic Ecology, Eawag: Swiss Federal Institute of

Aquatic Science and Technology ²⁵Genetics, Ecology and Evolution Department of Institute of 44 Biological Sciences, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais ²⁶Cavanilles Institute for 45 Biodiversity and Evolutionary Biology, University of Valencia ²⁷ENTPE, Université Claude 46 47 Bernard Lyon 1²⁸Institute of Earth Sciences, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland ²⁹Limnology Laboratory, Zoology Museum OCAZ-I ³⁰School of 48 Biological Sciences, Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador ³¹Department of Ecology, 49 Montana State University ³²Department of Biological Sciences, Université du Québec à Montréal 50 ³³School of Biological Sciences, University of Western Australia ³⁴Marine Institute, Ireland 51 ³⁵Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre (MARE), Department of Life Sciences, University 52 of Coimbra ³⁶Department of Microbiology and Ecology, University of Valencia ³⁷Institute of 53 Nature Conservation, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland ³⁸Department of Geography, 54 University of Utah ³⁹Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, UiT The Arctic University of 55 Norway ⁴⁰Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), Tromsø, Norway ⁴¹Research 56 Institute for the Environment and Livelihoods, Charles Darwin University ⁴²Department of 57 Ecology and Animal Biology, University of Vigo ⁴³Escuela de Biología, Universidad de San 58 Carlos de Guatemala⁴⁴Ecology and Evolution Program, University of Montana⁴⁵Centre for 59 Applied Water Science, Institute for Applied Ecology, University of Canberra, Australia 60 ⁴⁶CSIRO Land and Water, Canberra, Australia ⁴⁷Instituto de Ecología, Univerdiad Mayor de San 61 Andrés ⁴⁸Institute for Biochemistry and Biology, Potsdam University ⁴⁹Universidade Federal de 62 Mato Grosso do Sul, Campus Três Lagoas ⁵⁰International Institute for Sustainable Development, 63 Canada ⁵¹Shiiba Research Forest, Kyushu University ⁵²Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, 64 Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja ⁵³Department of Environmental Sciences, University of 65 Yamanashi ⁵⁴Faculty of Science, Ontario Tech University ⁵⁵Global Water Center, University of 66 Nevada, Reno ⁵⁶Department of Aquatic Ecology and Environmental Biology, Radboud 67 University ⁵⁷Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University ⁵⁸Forest Ecology 68 and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå ⁵⁹Department of Biology, 69 University of Regina ⁶⁰Department of Ecology and Zoology, Federal University of Santa 70 Catarina, Brazil ⁶¹Department of Biology, Memorial University of Newfoundland 71 ⁶²Environmental Studies Program, The Evergreen State College ⁶³Center for Limnology, 72 University of Wisconsin ⁶⁴Department of Fisheries & Aquatic Science, University of Eldoret, 73 Kenya ⁶⁵Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Cornell University 74 ⁶⁶Department of Aquatic Sciences and Assessment, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences 75 ⁶⁷Institute of Biology, Federal University of Bahia (UFBA) ⁶⁸Department of Biology, Faculty of 76 Science, University of Zagreb ⁶⁹Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Ehime University 77 ⁷⁰Department of Ecology & Genetics, University of Oulu ⁷¹Instituto de Ciencias Marinas y 78 Limnologicas, Universidad Austral de Chile ⁷²Oulanka Research Station, University of Oulu 79 ⁷³National Antarctic Scientific Center of Ukraine ⁷⁴Institute of Molecular Biology and Genetics, 80 National Institute of Science of Ukraine ⁷⁵Department of Biological Science, Virginia Institute of 81 Marine Science, College of William and Mary ⁷⁶Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality 82 Management Group, Wageningen University ⁷⁷Research Center on Ecosystems of Patagonia, 83 Centro de Investigacion en Ecosistemas de la Patagonia ⁷⁸Department of Forest & Conservation 84 Sciences, University of British Columbia ⁷⁹Departamento de Biología, Universidad del Zulia 85 ⁸⁰Department of Systems Ecology and Sustainability, University of Bucharest ⁸¹School of 86 Environmental Studies, University of Eldoret ⁸²Institute of Biology, University of Latvia 87 ⁸³Department of Ecology and Environmental Science, Umeå University ⁸⁴Departamento de 88 Ecología y Gestión Ambiental, Universidad de la República (CURE)⁸⁵Institute of Agricultural 89

- ⁹⁰ and Environmental Science, Estonian University of Life Sciences ⁸⁶Department of Biological
- 91 Sciences, Virginia Tech ⁸⁷Department of Biology, University of Waterloo ⁸⁸Canadian Rivers
- 92 Institute ⁸⁹School of Science, Technology and Engineering, University of the Sunshine Coast
- ⁹³ ⁹⁰Department of Landscape Architecture, Soochow University ⁹¹Zhejiang Institute of Research
- and Innovation, The University of Hong Kong ⁹² U.S. Geological Survey Integrated Information
- 95 Dissemination Division
- 96 Corresponding author: David Costello (dcostel3@kent.edu)

97 Key Points:

- Nitrogen and phosphorus immobilization was measured on organic matter (cotton) in 100 rivers and riparian zones representing 11 biomes
- Elevated temperature in riparian zones and phosphate in rivers increased immobilization,
 and consequently accelerated decomposition
- Nitrogen and phosphorus immobilization was strongly linked by microbial stoichiometry despite widely varied surface-water nutrient ratios

105 Abstract

Microbes play a critical role in plant litter decomposition and influence the fate of carbon in 106 107 rivers and riparian zones. When decomposing low-nutrient plant litter, microbes acquire nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) from the environment (i.e., nutrient immobilization), and this process is 108 potentially sensitive to nutrient loading and changing climate. Nonetheless, environmental 109 controls on immobilization are poorly understood because rates are also influenced by plant litter 110 111 chemistry, which is coupled to the same environmental factors. Here we used a standardized, low-nutrient organic matter substrate (cotton strips) to quantify nutrient immobilization at 100 112 paired stream and riparian sites representing 11 biomes worldwide. Immobilization rates varied 113 114 by 3 orders of magnitude, were greater in rivers than riparian zones, and were strongly correlated to decomposition rates. In rivers, P immobilization rates were controlled by surface water 115 phosphate concentrations, but N immobilization rates were not related to inorganic nitrogen. The 116 N:P of immobilized nutrients was tightly constrained to a molar ratio of 10:1 despite wide 117 118 variation in surface water N:P. Immobilization rates were temperature-dependent in riparian zones but not related to temperature in rivers. However, in rivers nutrient supply ultimately 119 120 controlled whether microbes could achieve the maximum expected decomposition at a given 121 temperature. Collectively, we demonstrated that exogenous nutrient supply and immobilization 122 are critical control points for decomposition of organic matter.

123 Plain Language Summary

Bacteria and fungi contribute to the breakdown of leaf litter in rivers and floodplains. To break down leaf litter, these microbes need the nutrients nitrogen and phosphorus, and microbes can get nutrients either from the leaf litter itself or from the environment. Most leaf litter has low nutrient content and microbes must rely on the environment to supply nutrients. We studied

microbial nutrient uptake from the environment during litter breakdown to determine whether it 128 varies predictably across the globe and how it is influenced by changing climate and nutrient 129 pollution. In 100 rivers and floodplains in 11 of Earth's major biomes we placed small strips of 130 cotton as stand-ins for leaf litter. Nutrient uptake was consistently greater on cotton strips that 131 were submerged in the river compared to cotton on the floodplain. For microbes in the river, 132 133 nutrient uptake was faster in instances where there was more phosphorus in the water. For microbes in the floodplain, nutrient uptake was faster where temperatures were warmer. Faster 134 nutrient uptake by microbes was linked with faster cotton breakdown in rivers and floodplains. 135 Our study shows that climate change and nutrient pollution can alter the activity of microbes in 136 rivers and floodplains. 137

138

139 **1 Introduction**

The uptake, storage, transformation, and release of nutrients by microorganisms are among the 140 141 most important contributions that riverine ecosystems make to global biogeochemical cycles. However, microbially mediated nutrient uptake and transformation are influenced by 142 environmental conditions, which makes these processes particularly sensitive to global change 143 drivers including rising temperature, nutrient loading, and chemical contaminants (Boyero et al., 144 2011; Burdon et al., 2020; Woodward et al., 2012). Detrital carbon (C) from terrestrial plants is 145 abundant in riparian zones and rivers (Sutfin et al., 2016; Tank et al., 2010) and this resource 146 fuels microbial communities and associated nutrient uptake and transformation across the 147 terrestrial-aquatic boundary. Detrital C is used by microbial decomposers most efficiently when 148 149 nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) are readily available; however, pools of N and P can differ between riparian and river habitats and are increasing worldwide, with potential implications for 150

151	rates of organic-matter mineralization. In both habitats, the dynamics of N and P on
152	decomposing plant litter have shown characteristic patterns (Manzoni et al., 2010; Webster &
153	Benfield, 1986). Early in decomposition of carbon-rich materials, nutrients are acquired by
154	microbes from the environment, resulting in a net increase in microbial pools of N and P above
155	that supplied from the litter itself (i.e., nutrient immobilization), whereas in later stages, there is a
156	net release of nutrient mass from microbial pools (i.e., nutrient mineralization) as substrates
157	degrade. Nutrient mineralization has received more attention than nutrient immobilization, and
158	litter chemistry (e.g., C:N, lignin content) appears to be the dominant driver of mineralization
159	rates (Manzoni et al., 2010; Parton et al., 2007).
160	Current understanding of the controls on nutrient untake and release during plant litter
100	Current understanding of the controls on nutrient uptake and release during plant inter
161	decomposition of plant matter begins with litter chemistry, which varies widely among plant
162	species (Boyero et al., 2017; Parton et al., 2007). Exogenous factors such as climate and soil
163	nutrient concentrations are predicted to indirectly influence microbial nutrient dynamics through
164	changes in litter quality (Classen et al., 2015; Manzoni et al., 2008). However, comparative
165	studies of nutrient dynamics during decomposition at broad spatial scales have mostly used
166	natural litter, potentially confounding the chemistry of plant litter with the environmental factors
167	that produced it (Boyero et al., 2017; Pastor et al., 2014). Standardized organic-matter substrates
168	allow for stronger inferences about the role of exogenous factors in governing nutrient
169	immobilization by the microbes that drive decomposition. However, the use of standardized
170	organic matter substrates is commonly used at small spatial scales along narrow nutrient
171	gradients (e.g., Cheever et al., 2013; Pastor et al., 2014) and the only large-scale study using
172	standardized substrates did not directly measure microbial uptake (Woodward et al., 2012). Few
173	studies have quantified both N and P immobilization within the same decomposing substrate (but

manuscript submitted to Global Biogeochemical Cycles

see Robbins et al., 2019) thus we have limited evidence about the stoichiometry of 174 immobilization. Bacteria (inclusive of all decomposer prokaryotes) and fungi are the primary 175 176 decomposers of plant litter, and both taxa can produce biomass with an N:P reflective of the nutrient supply (Danger & Chauvet, 2013; Godwin & Cotner, 2015). Thus, we may expect 177 substantial flexibility in the N:P of new decomposer biomass, resulting in N:P of immobilization 178 179 that is related to the exogenous nutrient supply. Furthermore, microbial uptake of nutrients, like other metabolic processes, may be constrained by temperature (e.g., Brown et al., 2004, Follstad 180 Shah et al. 2017) and affected by moisture availability (Boyero et al., 2011). Therefore, studies 181 of how homogenous substrates decompose along broad climatic gradients and outside the wetted 182 183 channel are needed to gain understanding about a more complete set of exogenous drivers. 184 To isolate how exogenous drivers influence nutrient dynamics during litter decomposition, we 185 conducted a field experiment in which we deployed a standard organic substrate (cotton) in 100 186 rivers and their riparian zones distributed across Earth's major biomes and measured nutrient 187 immobilization potential. Cotton is composed almost entirely of cellulose (Tiegs et al., 2013), and natural sources of plant litter also have substantial cellulose content (e.g., 40% for common 188 189 oak species in Europe; Fioretto et al., 2005). This nutrient-poor organic-matter substrate obligates microbes to immobilize N and P in order to respire the cellulose. The rate of 190 immobilization, and thus indirectly the rate of cotton decomposition, is limited by the availability 191 of nutrients in the environment. Nutrient availability differs along the river-riparian boundary, 192 193 and we hypothesized that immobilization in riparian zones would be less than in adjacent rivers due to intermittent fluxes of water and nutrients. We hypothesized that immobilization rates 194 195 would be governed by ambient temperature in accordance with metabolic scaling (Brown et al.,

196 2004). Thus, we predicted that global patterns of nutrient immobilization rates and ratios could

197 be predicted from latitude and terrestrial biome classification as proxies for climate (Dodds et al.

198 2019). Finally, we hypothesized that coupling between N and P immobilization would be weak

as the bacteria and fungi that colonize and decompose cotton (Burdon et al., 2020; Colas et al.,

200 2019) are stoichiometrically flexible.

201 **2 Materials and Methods**

202 2.1 Field sites

A standardized decomposition assay using cotton strips was implemented in more than 500 203 riverine ecosystems by the Cellulose Decomposition Experiment (CELLDEX) (Tiegs et al., 204 2019). Partners completed the decomposition assay in rivers and their adjacent riparian zone 205 during peak litterfall. When possible, they logged ambient temperature (hourly) in both habitats 206 207 (details in Tiegs et al. 2019) and when deploying cotton strips recorded specific conductance, ammonium (NH $_4^+$), nitrate (NO $_3^-$), phosphate (PO $_4^{3-}$), and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) 208 concentrations. Surface water PO_4^{3-} and NO_3^{-} spanned three orders of magnitude, which was 209 210 similar to the gradient in nutrient concentrations observed in the only other large scale study of nutrient effects on decomposition (Woodward et al., 2012). Measurements of nutrient 211 immobilization were made for a subset of the CELLDEX sites (99 rivers and 100 riparian zones), 212 with priority given to sites with supporting data on river temperature and nutrient concentrations 213 (50-71% of sites, depending on analyte, Text S1). If >10 sites within a biome had supporting 214 data, 10 of them were randomly selected. The resulting subset represented 11 biomes with at 215 least two rivers in each biome (with the exception of deserts) that had NO₃⁻ and PO₄³⁻ 216

measurements (Figure S1). Paired rivers and riparian zones were included in the subsample with
the exception of a river in a tropical wet forest where high flows caused loss of the strips.

219 2.2 Cotton deployment and analyses

220 Cotton strips were used as a low-nutrient analogue for leaf litter. The standardized material was composed of 95% cellulose with 7180 μ g N g⁻¹ dry mass (dm) and 64 μ g P g⁻¹ dm. The molar 221 stoichiometry of cotton (C:N = 275, C:P = 17,000) suggests large nutrient deficiencies (relative 222 to C) near the maxima observed in natural leaf litter (Manzoni et al., 2010; McGroddy et al., 223 2004). However, the N:P ratio of 62:1 was similar to that observed for some tropical leaf litter 224 (Boyero et al., 2017; McGroddy et al., 2004). We expected that the cotton strips would be 225 colonized by heterotrophic bacteria and fungi, and growth of autotrophs was limited by shading 226 from riparian vegetation in most of our rivers (channel width <5 m at 80% of sites). Strips were 227 prepared according to published methods (Tiegs et al., 2013, 2019) and 4 replicate strips per 228 river channel and 4 per riparian zone were deployed. In the river, strips were attached to nylon 229 rope with cable ties and secured to a stake. In the riparian zone, strips were placed in contact 230 231 with the soil or surface organic matter. Deployment lasted approximately 3-4 weeks (range 12-57 d), which is a sufficient period to detect microbial degradation (as loss of tensile strength) in both 232 habitats (Tiegs et al., 2019). Upon retrieval, strips were placed in ethanol (<1 min) to arrest 233 microbial activity and dried (40 °C) before analysis. The brief submergence in ethanol had no 234 effect on nutrient concentrations (Figure S2). 235

236 Decomposition during incubation in the field was assessed as loss of tensile strength, resulting

from the microbial degradation of cellulose (Tiegs et al., 2013), as reported by Tiegs and

colleagues (2019). Strips were subsequently stored in a desiccator until reaching a stable mass

and then subsampled with a paper punch which removed small disks from the centerline of the

strips. Cotton disks were acid digested to measure P concentration, and C and N concentration 240 was measured with an elemental analyzer. Detailed methods, recovery of standard reference 241 242 materials, and procedural reproducibility are described in the Supporting Information (Text S1, Table S1).

243

2.3 Data analysis 244

N and P immobilization was calculated based on the assumption that C:N and C:P of 245

decomposing litter decreases linearly as a function of mass loss (Aber & Melillo, 1982; Manzoni 246 et al., 2010). We assumed that any increase in nutrient concentration was a result of assimilation 247 by heterotrophic microbes, but we acknowledge that other processes may also contribute to 248 changes in cotton nutrient content (e.g., algal colonization, P precipitation). Algal assimilation is 249 a relatively minor contribution to net nutrient uptake on detritus except under high light and high 250 251 nutrient conditions (Elosegi et al. 2018; Halvorson et al. 2019). If litter has a high initial C:nutrient ratio, linear changes in litter stoichiometry result in curvilinear trajectories in total N 252 and P mass as a function of mass remaining, where N and P are initially net immobilized (i.e., 253 254 nutrient mass increases) until reaching a peak when net nutrient mineralization starts (Aber & Melillo, 1982; Berendse et al., 1987; Manzoni et al., 2008). We used the initial and final C 255 content of disks punched from the cotton strips to estimate mass loss and the C:N and C:P ratios 256 to calculate the maximum nutrient mass immobilized (N and P factors), the rate at which N and P 257 were immobilized (N_{IMM} and P_{IMM}, respectively), and the length of time that cotton immobilized 258 nutrients (T_{IMM}). See Supporting Information for details of the calculations (Text S1). Nutrient 259 immobilization rates, factors, and T_{IMM} were log-normally distributed with a positive skew, and 260 thus all rates, factors, ratios, and times were summarized as geometric means (Isles, 2020). It was 261 not possible to calculate NIMM and PIMM when the substrate had no detectable carbon loss, and 262

manuscript submitted to Global Biogeochemical Cycles

thus some strips could not generate estimates of immobilization (7 and 15% of the river and riparian strips). Additionally, estimates of T_{IMM} and nutrient factors (but not N_{IMM} and P_{IMM}) for strips showing minimal, although detectable, carbon mass loss were insufficiently precise and hence were also excluded from all analyses (Text S1, Figures S3–4).

Nutrient immobilization factors and rates were calculated for individual cotton strips and 267 compared among biomes and latitude using linear mixed models with site as a random effect. For 268 strips that immobilized both N and P (68 rivers and 57 riparian zones), we calculated N:P of 269 270 immobilization on individual strips and tested for differences among biomes and latitude using 271 linear mixed models. A single decomposition rate (rate of tensile-strength loss, k) was estimated 272 at each river and riparian site; thus, k was correlated with mean immobilization rate from all 273 strips in a river or riparian zone. Mean immobilization rates in rivers were related to measures of 274 water quality using linear regression. Arrhenius plots were used to examine temperature 275 sensitivity of nutrient immobilization rates in riparian and river sites (separate mixed effects 276 models) with directly measured mean daily temperature during the incubation period. Immobilization rates were also regressed against the deviations (i.e., residuals) from the mean 277 rate of tensile-strength loss (Brown et al., 2004), which were calculated from Arrhenius plot 278 best-fit lines using the complete dataset of Tiegs and colleagues (2019). All statistical analyses 279 were completed in R version 4.0.2 (R Core Team, 2020) and mixed models were fit using the 280 281 lme4 package.

282 **3 Results**

In all 99 rivers, the decomposer community immobilized P while breaking down cotton. In contrast, N immobilization was detectable in only 68 rivers. Of the 98 sites where strip mass was lost in riparian zones, each site immobilized P during breakdown, but N was immobilized at only

manuscript submitted to Global Biogeochemical Cycles

286	35 sites. Globally, nutrient immobilization was faster in rivers than in riparian zones with the
287	geometric mean (and interquartile ranges (IQR)) of 9.3 (4.4–19.7) and 4.8 (3.1–9.4) μ g P g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹
288	1 , respectively. N immobilization showed an even larger discrepancy between river (72 μg N g $^{-1}$
289	C d ⁻¹ ; IQR 32–277) and riparian habitats (16 μ g N g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹ ; IQR 17–74). On average,
290	decomposers were projected to immobilize P in rivers and riparian zones for 78 and 82 days (i.e.,
291	T_{IMM}), respectively, before net mineralization started. In contrast, N was predicted to be
292	immobilized in rivers and riparian zones for just 58 and 46 days, respectively.
293	3.1 Biome as a predictor of nutrient immobilization
294	Nutrient immobilization among rivers was highly variable, but this variation was only minimally
295	explained by the biome classification. Mean N_{IMM} was greatest in rivers of temperate broadleaf
296	forests (85 μ g N g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹) and least in rivers in mediterranean regions (1.8 μ g N g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹)
297	(Figure 1a), yet biome explained only 13% of the variation in N_{IMM} across all cotton strips
298	(Figure S5). The N factor was similar among biomes, with slightly more variance explained by
299	biome classification (19%, Figure S5). Biome offered slightly more explanatory power for P_{IMM}
300	(19%) than N _{IMM} , with the slowest rates in mediterranean rivers (3.7 μ g P g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹) and
301	significantly faster rates in rivers in desert, temperate grassland, and tropical wet forest biomes
302	(19, 19, 16 μ g P g ⁻¹ C d ⁻¹ , respectively, Figure 1b). In rivers, P factor exhibited similar biome
303	patterns to P _{IMM} (18% variance explained).



305

Figure 1. Nitrogen and phosphorus immobilization rates (N_{IMM} and P_{IMM} , respectively) and the molar ratio of the two rates from rivers (a-c) and riparian zones (d-f) in 11 biomes. Black bars indicate means for biomes $\pm 95\%$ confidence intervals. Rates are shown on a log+1 axis to include sites where nutrients were not immobilized during cotton decomposition (count of sites with N_{IMM} or $P_{IMM} = 0$ are given near x-axis). Biomes are ordered from slowest to fastest mean decomposition rate in riparian strips (Tiegs et al. 2019).

In rivers where both N and P were immobilized (n = 68), the N:P ratio of immobilization (i.e., N_{IMM}:P_{IMM}) was always >1, with 31% of the variation explained by biome type (Figure 1c, Figure S5). Rivers in montane and temperate grasslands had the lowest N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} (5 and 7, respectively), whereas tropical dry, tropical wet, and temperate broadleaf forests had the highest N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} (24, 22, and 19 respectively). The N factor:P factor did not differ substantially among biomes (Figure S5), but the relationship between N factor and P factor in log-log space showed a proportional relationship (slope = 1).

Nitrogen was not immobilized ($N_{IMM} = 0$) in 63% of the riparian sites with a null value observed 320 321 in at least one site from each biome (Figure 1d). Biome type did not predict riparian N_{IMM}, likely due to high within-site variation (Figure S5). On average, the rate of N_{IMM} in riparian zones was 322 0.9 µg N g⁻¹ C d⁻¹. The N factor was greatest in tropical wet forests and similar among all other 323 324 biomes. P immobilization was measured in all but two riparian sites that had detectable mass 325 loss, and 30 and 23% of the variation in P_{IMM} and P factor was explained by biome, respectively. 326 In general, tropical riparian zones had faster rates of P_{IMM} than temperate zones (Figure 1e). Tropical dry and tropical wet forest riparian zones had the fastest rates of P_{IMM} (both 11 µg P g⁻¹ 327 C d⁻¹) and temperate coniferous forests had the slowest (1.6 µg P g⁻¹ C d⁻¹). P_{IMM} was only 328 greater than N_{IMM} in the 61 sites where N_{IMM} was 0, but for the riparian zones from sites where 329 N_{IMM} and P_{IMM} were both detectable, rates of N_{IMM} always exceeded P_{IMM} (Figure 1f). Biome 330 was not predictive of NIMM: PIMM, which averaged 9:1 globally. 331

332 3.2 Immobilization and cellulose decomposition

333 There was a strong positive association between rates of nutrient immobilization and *k* in both

habitats but the relationship was much stronger in rivers than riparian zones (Figure 2). In rivers

and riparian zones, sites with slow decomposition more frequently did not immobilize any N

(i.e., $N_{IMM} = 0$) (Figure 2a & b). In riparian zones, *k* was weakly associated with N_{IMM} (Figure 2b) but there was a stronger correlation in rivers (Figure 2a). Decomposition was correlated positively to P_{IMM} , but similar to N, relationships were stronger in rivers (Figure 2c & d).





Figure 2. Decomposition rates are positively associated with nitrogen (a & b) and phosphorus (c & d) immobilization rates in rivers (a & c) and riparian zones (b & d). Immobilization rates are on a log+1 axis to include sites where nutrients were not immobilized during

decomposition. Immobilization rates plotted are means of 2-4 cotton strips at each site.

- 344 Decomposition rates (loss of tensile strength) were calculated at the site scale with 2-4 cotton
- 345 strips (see Tiegs et al. 2019). Symbol colors correspond to different biomes.

347 3.3 Water quality and immobilization

Some water quality parameters exhibited broad geographic patterns (Text S2) – most notably a 348 negative correlation between PO_4^{3-} and absolute latitude (p = 0.001) and greater concentrations 349 of NH_4^+ in temperate grasslands (p = 0.02). However, NO_3^- , dissolved inorganic N (DIN), and 350 DIN:PO₄³⁻ did not show any geographic patterns. River water PO₄³⁻ was the only variable 351 significantly related to k (p = 0.002). There was also a strong relationship between P_{IMM} and 352 PO_4^{3-} concentrations (Figure 3b). In contrast, neither k (p = 0.27) nor N_{IMM} (p = 0.46) were 353 correlated with DIN (Figure 3a). For instance, we documented rivers with relatively high DIN 354 (i.e., >100 μ g L⁻¹) that did not immobilize N and rivers with relatively low DIN (i.e., <10 μ g L⁻¹) 355 where N_{IMM} was in excess of 100 µg N g⁻¹ C d⁻¹. The lack of a relationship between surface 356 water N and N_{IMM} was also reflected in poor relationships between NH₄⁺ and N_{IMM} (p = 0.68), 357 surface water DIN:PO₄³⁻ and N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} (Figure 3c), and NH₄⁺:PO₄³⁻ and N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} (p = 0.75). 358 Interestingly, there was a weak postive relationship between N_{IMM} and PO_4^{3-} concentrations (p = 359 0.06). Notably, NIMM: PIMM were constrained to a relatively narrow range (50% of NIMM: PIMM 360 between 10 and 20), whereas surface water N:P varied by 3 orders of magnitude (50% of 361 $DIN:PO_4^{3-}$ between 4 and 194). 362







369 3.4 Temperature and immobilization

- Arrhenius plots of the entire dataset of all sites (n = 415 river and n = 533 riparian sites)
- indicated strong temperature dependence of k in rivers, but only a weak relationship in riparian
- zones (Tiegs et al., 2019). The sites used in the current analysis reflected the same relationships
- between *k* and temperature as the larger dataset (Tiegs et al., 2019, Figure S7), which suggests

- 374 little bias in our site selection. Nutrient immobilization exhibited strong temperature dependence
- in riparian sites (slopes: $N_{IMM} = -0.52$, $P_{IMM} = -0.49$), but not in rivers (slopes: $N_{IMM} = -0.01$,
- $P_{IMM} = -0.12$) (Figure 4). The contrasting temperature effects on riparian and river habitats were
- 377 reflected in latitudinal patterns in immobilization (Text S2, Figure S8).



378

Figure 4. Temperature dependence of nitrogen (a) and phosphorus (b) immobilization on cotton in rivers and riparian zones. Immobilization in riparian zones increased with increasing temperature (p < 0.02) but immobilization in rivers was not related to temperature (p > 0.40). Colors denote rivers and riparian zones from different biomes (see legend in Fig. 2).

Collectively, our data indicate that k was sensitive to temperature, especially in rivers, but there 384 was substantial variation among individual sites with similar temperatures (Figure S7, Tiegs et 385 386 al., 2019). Deviations in $\ln(k)$ from the expected value (based on Tiegs et al., 2019) were strongly related to immobilization rates in rivers, but not in riparian zones (Figure 5). In rivers, 387 sites with positive deviations from the temperature relationship (i.e., faster k than expected) were 388 389 characterized by faster rates of NIMM and PIMM, whereas the opposite was true for sites with slower k than expected (Figure 5). In contrast, N_{IMM} only weakly explained deviations in ln(k) in 390 riparian zones (Figure 5a), particularly when we excluded all sites with $N_{IMM} = 0$ (p = 0.24, r² < 391 0.06). Similarly, riparian P_{IMM} did not significantly explain the deviations in ln(k) from expected 392 values (Figure 5b). 393



Figure 5. Relationship between nitrogen (a) and phosphorus (b) immobilization rates on cotton
 and deviations in decomposition rate from global trends in temperature sensitivity (Tiegs et al.
 2019). In rivers, faster rates of nutrient immobilization are related to positive deviation (i.e.,
 decomposition rates that are faster than the global average at that temperature). Nutrient
 immobilization on cotton in riparian soils was not predictive of deviations in decomposition.

400 4 Discussion

The microbes on our experimental cotton substrates immobilized N and P during decomposition 401 at rates within the range measured for natural leaf litter. In riparian zones, N_{IMM} on cotton was 402 similar to rates measured on six leaf litter species (20–33 µg N g⁻¹ C d⁻¹; Aber & Melillo, 1982) 403 but lower than those for crop residues in agricultural soils (462 µg N g⁻¹ C d⁻¹; Recous et al., 404 1995). In rivers, N_{IMM} on cotton was within the range of immobilization on natural litter 405 measured either by N accumulation in residual litter (Robbins et al., 2019) or isotopic dilution in 406 microbial pools (Cheever et al., 2013; Pastor et al., 2014). P immobilization on decomposing 407 litter is rarely measured, but our rates of P_{IMM} on cotton were similar to those recorded for three 408 litter types in an artificial stream (0–12 µg P g⁻¹ C d⁻¹; Robbins et al., 2019). Our approach, like 409 that used by most previous studies of nutrient immobilization, could not distinguish assimilation 410 by autotrophs on cotton from immobilization by decomposers, but natural shading of the stream 411 412 channel likely limited algal contributions to net nutrient uptake (Elosegi et al. 2018; Halvorson et al. 2019). 413

414 Nutrient immobilization exhibited broad spatial patterns for cellulose decomposing in riparian zones, whereas in rivers, rates were more strongly controlled by local factors. Terrestrial biome, 415 which is a proxy for climate, offered limited explanatory power of immobilization for rivers (13-416 417 19%), but explained slightly more variance for immobilization in riparian zones (23–30%). Similarly, latitude was a poor predictor of immobilization with the exception of P_{IMM} in riparian 418 zones, which was slower at high latitudes. We observed an unbalanced influence of temperature 419 and moisture across the riparian-river boundary. Annual precipitation is understandably less of a 420 driver in rivers given that the sites studied were perennial. Conversely, moisture likely influences 421 microbial decomposition and immobilization in riparian zones given their drier environment 422

(Sutfin et al., 2016). Temperature also had greater influence on immobilization in riparian zones 423 than rivers, likely due to differences in the accessibility of exogenous nutrients between habitats. 424 Rivers provide a continuous supply of inorganic nutrients that are accessible to microbial 425 decomposers, and the supply rates influence immobilization. However, riparian zones receive 426 more irregular supply of nutrients, and microbes are reliant on biologically mediated processes 427 428 (e.g., N fixation, extracellular enzymes) (Allison & Vitousek, 2005; Vitousek & Hobbie, 2000). Conductivity, pH, DOC, and ammonium differed in rivers within some biomes, but none of these 429 variables corresponded with immobilization rates. Although there was a strong latitudinal 430 gradient in PO₄³⁻ in our study sites, there was only a weak, but directionally consistent, negative 431 relationship between latitude and P_{IMM} ($r^2 = 0.03$). Collectively, these results indicate that 432 controls of nutrient immobilization on decomposing litter can differ profoundly between riparian 433 zones and adjacent rivers. 434

435 We observed strong relationships between rates of cellulose degradation and P_{IMM} , which suggests that P availability is a fundamental control on microbial decomposition of low-nutrient 436 plant litter. Although we did not directly manipulate nutrients, our findings are consistent with 437 experiments that have demonstrated faster decomposition under nutrient enrichment in many 438 biomes (Ferreira et al., 2015). Correlations between immobilization and decomposition were 439 stronger for P than N in both rivers and riparian zones. Enrichment of N and P have both been 440 shown to stimulate microbial decomposers (Ferreira et al., 2015; Rosemond et al., 2015; 441 Woodward et al., 2012), but in some rivers only P enrichment has stimulated decomposition 442 (Burdon et al., 2020; Elwood et al., 1981; Newbold et al., 1983). The substrate used in this study 443 444 was low in both N and P, but the relative abundance of these two elements (N:P = 62:1) indicated a greater P imbalance relative to microbial decomposers. This relative N enrichment is 445

common for litter; global analyses indicated average litter N:P of 46:1 for all senesced leaves 446 (McGroddy et al., 2004) and 58:1 for riparian litter (Boyero et al., 2017). Therefore, P-limited 447 448 litter may be a common substrate for microbial decomposers regardless of streamwater nutrient concentrations, and immobilization of exogenous P may be a critical limiting reaction for 449 decomposition. Human-dominated catchments often receive excessive inputs of P from 450 451 fertilizers or sewage (Birk et al., 2020; Carpenter et al., 1998), and our study provides further evidence that nutrient loading may increase organic matter decomposition in addition to its 452 widely recognized enhancement of plant growth. 453

454 The relationships we observed between immobilization rates and water quality demonstrate the importance of exogenous sources of N and P for microbial decomposers in rivers globally 455 (Woodward et al., 2012). The strong positive relationship between PO_4^{3-} and P_{IMM} is reasonable 456 given the P-limited substrate. However, future work would be beneficial to understand the 457 458 relative contribution of heterotrophic assimilation, autotrophic assimilation, and abiotic 459 precipitation of P (potentially stimulated by microbial activity) to our calculated immobilization rates. The lack of relationship between dissolved N and N_{IMM} may be explained by the microbial 460 decomposers being P limited or due to alternative sources of N. We observed river sites with 461 relatively high DIN (>200 µg L⁻¹) that immobilized no N during decomposition. In these rivers, 462 P concentrations were low (PO₄³⁻ <5 µg L⁻¹) and the substrate may have supplied sufficient N to 463 support microbial activity. Alternatively, some rivers had relatively low DIN concentrations (<10 464 μ g L⁻¹) with high rates of N_{IMM}, which may have been sustained by organic sources of N and/or 465 atmospheric N₂ through N fixation. Finally, the cotton substrate is a potential carbon source for 466 467 denitrifying bacteria, whose dissimilatory N products (i.e., N gasses) would not be included in N_{IMM}. However, the thin woven structure of the cotton strips and the deployment locations (i.e., 468

in the water column and at the soil surface) would be unlikely to generate the anoxic sites neededfor denitrification.

Our data indicate that the stoichiometry of microbial immobilization is influenced by microbial 471 biomass N:P and not availability in exogenous pools or substrate imbalance. When microbes 472 were immobilizing both nutrients, more N was immobilized than P (all N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} > 1), and the 473 ratio of immobilized nutrients was constrained to a relatively narrow range (mean 10:1) among 474 biomes and between rivers and riparian zones. On average, NIMM:PIMM was similar to the global 475 476 mean N:P of microbial biomass in soil (7:1, Cleveland & Liptzin, 2007) and litter-associated 477 fungal biomass (9:1, Gulis et al., 2017), suggesting the stoichiometry of heterotrophic immobilization is connected to the stoichiometry of microbial biomass. The mean NIMM:PIMM 478 479 matched the global average for microbial biomass despite the fact that the litter was more deficient in P than N and many rivers provisioned nutrients at a low N:P (a third of rivers had 480 DIN:PO₄³⁻ <10:1). Exogenous N:P in rivers varied widely (DIN:PO₄³⁻ between 1:1 and 1000:1), 481 482 but NIMM: PIMM covered a much narrower range. Although bacterial and fungal taxa can be nonhomeostatic (Danger & Chauvet, 2013; Godwin & Cotner, 2015) the communities decomposing 483 cotton immobilized nutrients at a relatively fixed N:P across our globally distributed sites. This 484 invariance in N:P at the ecosystem scale is consistent with observations of "ecosystem 485 homeostasis" in bacterial-dominated heterotrophic rivers (Schade et al., 2011) and fixed ratios of 486 exoenzymes in heterotrophic microbes (Hill et al., 2012; Sinsabaugh et al., 2009). Furthermore, 487 the observed N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} may represent the averaging of the N:P of the microbial communities 488 that can decompose this cellulose substrate (sensu Klausmeier et al., 2004). Consequently, if 489

490 microbes are P-limited, increasing PO_4^{3-} through nutrient loading is expected to increase rates of 491 P_{IMM} and N_{IMM} , as microbes immobilize nutrients at a fixed ratio.

Although immobilization in rivers was not directly influenced by surface water temperatures, 492 about half of the previously observed residual variation in the temperature dependence of 493 decomposition (Tiegs et al., 2019) was explained by N_{IMM} and P_{IMM}. Thus, while water 494 temperature sets the potential rate of decomposition, the external nutrient supply appears to 495 determine whether microbes achieve the maximum potential rate. In contrast, riparian nutrient 496 497 immobilization was directly controlled by temperature and thus co-varied with decomposition. 498 Together these observations suggest that warmer temperatures in the future may have contrasting effects on decomposition and immobilization in riparian zones versus rivers. Although terrestrial 499 decomposition is expected to increase with warming, our data indicate that future changes in 500 501 precipitation may have more of an influence on riparian immobilization and decomposition than 502 warming (Tiegs et al., 2019; Yin et al., 2019). Decomposition was temperature-sensitive in 503 rivers, which supports predictions of faster decomposition under warming conditions (e.g., Boyero et al., 2011; Follstad Shah et al., 2017; Tiegs et al., 2019), but immobilization did not 504 505 show strong relationships with temperature. Therefore, warming may not increase decomposition rates if surface water nutrient supply is stable or declining. The interactive effects of warming 506 and eutrophication are well-recognized in autotrophic ecosystems (e.g., Binzer et al., 2016), and 507 here we identified pathways by which these two global stressors may interact in heterotrophic 508 ecosystems. 509

510 In rivers, leaf litter delivers an important subsidy of C to fuel microbial decomposers, but the N 511 and P in microbial biomass is derived from both the plant litter itself and the environment. To 512 understand the relative contributions of these two processes we made a hypothetical comparison

513	of N and P fluxes that were sourced exclusively from plant litter or solely from the environment
514	(i.e., litter only provides C). For representative ecosystems within each biome (Table S2), we
515	compared expected annual nutrient flux from leaf litter tissue (using models from Boyero et al.,
516	2017) to the flux from nutrient immobilization (using mean P_{IMM} , N_{IMM} , and T_{IMM} for each
517	biome). Across all biomes, leaf litter contributed more N to rivers than microbial immobilization
518	(Figure 6a). At most, immobilized N flux was 60% of the flux expected from leaf litter (in
519	tropical dry and temperate broadleaf forests). For P, it is possible for immobilization to provide a
520	similar or larger annual flux of P to microbial pools than leaf litter (Figure 6b), with larger
521	immobilization fluxes than litter flux possible in deserts and temperate broadleaf forests.
522	Microbial N and P on natural litter is a mix of litter-derived and immobilized nutrients, but this
523	hypothetical analysis demonstrates that the two sources may be comparable, especially for P.
524	However, nutrients supplied through litter may be in relatively recalcitrant organic molecules,
525	whereas immobilized N and P are likely to be in more labile forms. The eventual fate of
526	endogenous and exogenous nutrients involved in litter breakdown has consequences for the long-
527	term fate of nutrients, whether those detrital nutrients fuel riverine communities or are
528	transported downstream.



Figure 6. Nitrogen (a) and phosphorus (b) immobilization areal flux in rivers compared to 531 other major fluxes. Immobilization fluxes are the product of geometric mean rates for a biome 532 and measured litter fluxes in representative rivers within those biomes (see Table S2 for site 533 details). "Litter input" shows N and P flux from endogenous nutrients in leaf litter; estimates 534 are the product of litter flux in representative rivers and N and P content, predicted from mean 535 annual precipitation (N) and mean annual temperature (P) (Boyero et al. 2017). Instantaneous 536 N and P flux assume a concentrated pulse of leaf litter (i.e., time of litter fall << time of 537 immobilization) and rates of litter input from representative rivers. NO₃⁻, NH₄⁺, and PO₄³⁻ 538 uptake are whole-stream uptake (U) summarized by boxplots of median (vertical line) and 539 interquartile range (IQR). Measurement of NH_4^+ and PO_4^{3-} uptake are from the review by 540 Ensign and Doyle (2006), and measurement of NO_3^- uptake is from Ensign and Doyle (2006) 541 and the LINX-II study (Hall et al. 2009). N fixation fluxes are summarized as a median and 542 IQR from Marcarelli et al. (2008). 543

We also examined whether immobilization can account for a large portion of nutrient flux at the 544 ecosystem scale by comparing microbial immobilization fluxes to whole-stream nutrient fluxes. 545 546 The flux of nutrients due to immobilization only occurs during the seasons of peak litter fall (i.e., autumn in temperate zones and the dry season in the tropics) and instantaneous rates of 547 immobilization were comparable to whole-stream uptake for N but not P. Instantaneous N 548 549 immobilization was highest in forest biomes and was similar or higher than whole-stream uptake of NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ in many biomes (Figure 6a). Instantaneous N immobilization was higher than 550 N fixation by 1–2 orders of magnitude (Figure 6a). Thus, during peak litterfall, immobilization 551 by microbes may be the dominant flux of N from the water column. Although our estimates 552 showed that P flux from immobilization could be similar to P flux from litter, instantaneous P 553 immobilization was 1–2 orders of magnitude lower than estimated whole-stream PO_4^{3-} uptake 554 (Figure 6b). Riverbeds remove P through both biotic assimilation and abiotic sorption, and 555 microbial immobilization only approaches this flux at very high rates of litter input (e.g., 556 temperate broadleaf and tropical wet forests). For streams where both N and P uptake were 557 measured, the average N:P ratio of whole-stream uptake (NH_4^+ :PO₄³⁻ = 4:1, NO_3^- :PO₄³⁻ = 3:1, 558 559 Ensign & Doyle, 2006) was lower than the average N:P of immobilization (10:1). Furthermore, whole stream uptake NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ was <1 in 25% of streams (n = 65), but N_{IMM}:P_{IMM} <1 was 560 never observed in our study. These comparative approaches indicate that the total flux of P from 561 562 immobilization may be comparable to leaf litter inputs and N immobilization may be an 563 important component of whole-stream uptake during peak litterfall.

Local variation in ecosystem characteristics can be as important as global scale factors when considering drivers of decomposition (Bradford et al., 2015, 2017). Most studies emphasize local-scale variation in litter quality as the primary control of decomposition (Bradford et al.,

2015; Follstad Shah et al., 2017; LeRoy et al., 2020); yet, we observed substantial local-scale 567 variation in decomposition of a uniform substrate that we linked to differences in nutrient supply 568 569 and temperature. Moreover, we observed substantial patch-scale differences in the controls and rates of microbial decomposition across river-riparian boundaries within ecosystems. By 570 exploiting natural gradients in nutrient concentrations and climate at a global scale, we identified 571 572 the direct and indirect pathways by which exogenous nutrient supply and temperature modify microbial processes. Although degradation of cotton strips surely differs from decomposition of 573 plant litter, the broad mechanisms and patterns identified here would presumably apply to any 574 organic substrate with low nutrient content. In particular, the stoichiometric constraints on 575 immobilization in rivers across a broad gradient in nutrient supply and the temperature 576 invariance of immobilization rates among globally distributed rivers are new insights about how 577 nutrient loading and elevated temperatures from climate change may directly influence riverine 578 decomposition. 579

580 Acknowledgements

We thank a large number of assistants who helped field work, G. Moeen and M. Moeen for 581 preparing cotton strips, and N. Johnson, A. Minerovic, and C. Blackwood for help with C:N 582 analysis. This research was supported by awards to S.D.T. from the Ecuadorian Ministry of 583 Science (Secretaría de Educación Superior Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación, SENESCYT) 584 through the PROMETEO scholar-exchange program, the Oakland University Research 585 Development Grant program, and a Huron Mountain Wildlife Foundation research grant. N.A.G. 586 was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Science, Biological and 587 Environmental Research. Oak Ridge National Laboratory is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC, for 588 589 the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725. PRL was supported by

- 590 NSERC and Canada Research Chair programs. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for
- descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

592 Data Availability Statement

- 593 All data and code for analyses and figures are available on GitHub which can be accessed from
- the persistent DOI https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5764917.

595 **References**

- Aber, J. D., & Melillo, J. M. (1982). Nitrogen immobilization in decaying hardwood leaf litter as
 a function of initial nitrogen and lignin content. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 60(11), 2263–
 2269. https://doi.org/10.1139/b82-277
- Allison, S. D., & Vitousek, P. M. (2005). Responses of extracellular enzymes to simple and
 complex nutrient inputs. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *37*(5), 937–944.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.09.014
- Berendse, F., Berg, B., & Bosatta, E. (1987). The effect of lignin and nitrogen on the
 decomposition of litter in nutrient-poor ecosystems: a theoretical approach. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 65(6), 1116–1120. https://doi.org/10.1139/b87-155
- Binzer, A., Guill, C., Rall, B. C., & Brose, U. (2016). Interactive effects of warming,
 eutrophication and size structure: impacts on biodiversity and food-web structure. *Global Change Biology*, 22(1), 220–227. https://doi.org/10.1111/GCB.13086
- Birk, S., Chapman, D., Carvalho, L., Spears, B. M., Andersen, H. E., Argillier, C., et al. (2020).
 Impacts of multiple stressors on freshwater biota across spatial scales and ecosystems.
 Nature Ecology & Evolution 2020 4:8, 4(8), 1060–1068. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559 020-1216-4
- Boyero, L., Pearson, R. G., Gessner, M. O., Barmuta, L. A., Ferreira, V., Graça, M. A. S., et al.
 (2011). A global experiment suggests climate warming will not accelerate litter
 decomposition in streams but might reduce carbon sequestration. *Ecology Letters*, 14(3),
- 615 289–294. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01578.x
- Boyero, L., Graça, M. A. S., Tonin, A. M., Pérez, J., Swafford, A. J., Ferreira, V., et al. (2017).
 Riparian plant litter quality increases with latitude. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 1–10.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-10640-3
- Bradford, M. A., Berg, B., Maynard, D. S., Wieder, W. R., & Wood, S. A. (2015).
 Understanding the dominant controls on litter decomposition. *Journal of Ecology*, *104*, 229–238. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12507

Bradford, M. A., Veen, G. F., Bonis, A., Bradford, E. M., Classen, A. T., Hans Cornelissen, J. 622 C., et al. (2017). A test of the hierarchical model of litter decomposition. Nature Ecology & 623 Evolution, 1, 1836. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0367-4 624 Brown, J. H., Gillooly, J. F., Allen, A. P., Savage, V. M., & West, G. B. (2004). Toward a 625 metabolic theory of ecology. Ecology, 85(7), 1771–1789. 626 627 Burdon, F. J., Bai, Y., Reyes, M., Tamminen, M., Staudacher, P., Mangold, S., et al. (2020). Stream microbial communities and ecosystem functioning show complex responses to 628 multiple stressors in wastewater. Global Change Biology, 26(11), 6363–6382. 629 630 https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15302 Carpenter, S. R., Caraco, N. F., Correll, D. L., Howarth, R. W., Sharpley, A. N., & Smith, V. H. 631 (1998). Nonpoint pollution of surface waters with phosphorus and nitrogen. Ecological 632 Applications, 8(3), 559-568. https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-633 0761(1998)008[0559:NPOSWW]2.0.CO;2 634 Cheever, B. M., Webster, J. R., Bilger, E. E., & Thomas, S. A. (2013). The relative importance 635 of exogenous and substrate-derived nitrogen for microbial growth during leaf 636 decomposition. Ecology, 94(7), 1614–1625. https://doi.org/10.1890/12-1339.1 637 Classen, A. T., Sundqvist, M. K., Henning, J. A., Newman, G. S., Moore, J. A. M., Cregger, M. 638 A., et al. (2015). Direct and indirect effects of climate change on soil microbial and soil 639 microbial-plant interactions: What lies ahead? *Ecosphere*, 6(8). 640 https://doi.org/10.1890/ES15-00217.1 641 642 Cleveland, C. C., & Liptzin, D. (2007). C:N:P stoichiometry in soil: Is there a "Redfield ratio" for the microbial biomass? Biogeochemistry, 85(3), 235-252. 643 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-007-9132-0 644 Colas, F., Woodward, G., Burdon, F. J., Guérold, F., Chauvet, E., Cornut, J., et al. (2019). 645 Towards a simple global-standard bioassay for a key ecosystem process: organic-matter 646 decomposition using cotton strips. *Ecological Indicators*, 106, 105466. 647 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105466 648 Danger, M., & Chauvet, E. (2013). Elemental composition and degree of homeostasis of fungi: 649 Are aquatic hyphomycetes more like metazoans, bacteria or plants? Fungal Ecology, 6(5), 650 453-457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2013.05.007 651 Dodds, W. K., Bruckerhoff, L., Batzer, D., Schechner, A., Pennock, C., Renner, E., et al. (2019). 652 The freshwater biome gradient framework: predicting macroscale properties based on 653 latitude, altitude, and precipitation. *Ecosphere*, 10(7), e02786. 654 https://doi.org/10.1002/ECS2.2786 655 Elosegi, A., Nicolás, A., & Richardson, J. S. (2018). Priming of leaf litter decomposition by 656 algae seems of minor importance in natural streams during autumn. PLoS ONE, 13(9), 1-657 13. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200180 658

Elwood, J. W., Newbold, J. D., Trimble, A. F., & Stark, R. W. (1981). The limiting role of 659 phosphorus in a woodland stream ecosystem: Effects of P enrichment on leaf decomposition 660 and primary producers. Ecology, 62(1), 146–158. https://doi.org/10.2307/1936678 661 Ensign, S. H., & Doyle, M. W. (2006). Nutrient spiraling in streams and river networks. Journal 662 of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 111(4), 1–13. 663 https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JG000114 664 Ferreira, V., Castagneyrol, B., Koricheva, J., Gulis, V., Chauvet, E., & Graça, M. A. S. (2015). A 665 meta-analysis of the effects of nutrient enrichment on litter decomposition in streams. 666 667 Biological Reviews, 90(3), 669–688. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12125 Fioretto, A., Di Nardo, C., Papa, S., & Fuggi, A. (2005). Lignin and cellulose degradation and 668 nitrogen dynamics during decomposition of three leaf litter species in a Mediterranean 669 ecosystem. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 37(6), 1083–1091. 670 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.11.007 671 Follstad Shah, J. J., Kominoski, J. S., Ardon, M., Dodds, W. K., Gessner, M. O., Griffiths, N. A., 672 et al. (2017). Global synthesis of the temperature sensitivity of leaf litter breakdown in 673 streams and rivers. Global Change Biology, 23(8), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13609 674 Godwin, C. M., & Cotner, J. B. (2015). Aquatic heterotrophic bacteria have highly flexible 675 phosphorus content and biomass stoichiometry. ISME Journal, 9(10), 2324–2327. 676 https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.34 677 Gulis, V., Kuehn, K. A., Schoettle, L. N., Leach, D., Benstead, J. P., & Rosemond, A. D. (2017). 678 Changes in nutrient stoichiometry, elemental homeostasis and growth rate of aquatic litter-679 associated fungi in response to inorganic nutrient supply. The ISME Journal, 11, 2729-680 2739. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2017.123 681 Hall, R. O., Tank, J. L., Sobota, D. J., Mulholland, P. J., O'Brien, J. M., Dodds, W. K., et al. 682 (2009). Nitrate removal in stream ecosystems measured by ¹⁵N addition experiments: Total 683 684 uptake. Limnology and Oceanography, 54(3), 653-665. https://doi.org/10.4319/LO.2009.54.3.0653 685 Halvorson, H. M., Francoeur, S. N., Findlay, R. H., & Kuehn, K. A. (2019). Algal-mediated 686 687 priming effects on the ecological stoichiometry of leaf litter decomposition: A metaanalysis. Frontiers in Earth Science, 7(April), 1–12. 688 https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2019.00076 689 Hill, B. H., Elonen, C. M., Seifert, L. R., May, A. A., & Tarquinio, E. (2012). Microbial enzyme 690 stoichiometry and nutrient limitation in US streams and rivers. Ecological Indicators, 691 692 18(July), 540–551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.01.007 693 Isles, P. D. F. (2020). The misuse of ratios in ecological stoichiometry. *Ecology*, 101(11), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3153 694

- Klausmeier, C. A., Litchman, E., Daufresne, T., & Levin, S. A. (2004). Optimal nitrogen-tophosphorus stoichiometry of phytoplankton. *Nature*, *429*(6988), 171–174.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02454
- LeRoy, C. J., Hipp, A. L., Lueders, K., Follstad Shah, J. J., Kominoski, J. S., Ardón, M., et al.
 (2020). Plant phylogenetic history explains in-stream decomposition at a global scale. *Journal of Ecology*, *108*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13262
- Manzoni, S., Jackson, R. B., Trofymow, J. A., & Porporato, A. (2008). The global stoichiometry
 of litter nitrogen mineralization. *Science*, *321*(5889), 684–686.
 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1159792
- Manzoni, S., Trofymow, J. A., Jackson, R. B., & Porporato, A. (2010). Stoichiometric controls
 on carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus dynamics in decomposing litter. *Ecological Monographs*, 80(1), 89–106. https://doi.org/10.1890/09-0179.1
- Marcarelli, A. M., Baker, M. A., & Wurtsbaugh, W. A. (2008). Is in-stream N2 fixation an
 important N source for benthic communities and stream ecosystems? *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, 27(1), 186–211. https://doi.org/10.1899/07-027.1
- McGroddy, M. E., Daufresne, T., & Hedin, L. O. (2004). Scaling of C:N:P stoichiometry in
 forests worldwide: Implications of terrestrial redfield-type ratios. *Ecology*, 85(9), 2390–
 2401. https://doi.org/10.1890/03-0351
- Newbold, J. D., Elwood, J. W., Schulze, M. S., Stark, R. W., & Barmeier, J. C. (1983).
- 714 Continuous ammonium enrichment of a woodland stream: uptake kinetics, leaf
- decomposition, and nitrification. *Freshwater Biology*, *13*(2), 193–204.
- 716 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1983.tb00671.x
- Parton, W., Silver, W. L., Burke, I. C., Grassens, L., Harmon, M. E., Currie, W. S., et al. (2007).
 Global-scale similarities in nitrogen release patterns during long-term decomposition. *Science*, *315*, 361–364.
- Pastor, A., Compson, Z. G., Dijkstra, P., Riera, J. L., Martí, E., Sabater, F., et al. (2014). Stream
 carbon and nitrogen supplements during leaf litter decomposition: Contrasting patterns for
 two foundation species. *Oecologia*, *176*(4), 1111–1121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442014-3063-y
- R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria:
 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from http://www.r-project.org
- Recous, S., Robin, D., Darwis, D., & Mary, B. (1995). Soil inorganic N availability: Effect on
 maize residue decomposition. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 27(12), 1529–1538.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0717(95)00096-W
- Robbins, C. J., Matthaeus, W. J., Cook, S. C., Housley, L. M., Robison, S. E., Garbarino, M. A.,
 et al. (2019). Leaf litter identity alters the timing of lotic nutrient dynamics. *Freshwater Biology*, 64(12), 2247–2259. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13410

- Rosemond, A. D., Benstead, J. P., Bumpers, P. M., Gulis, V., Kominoski, J. S., Manning, D. W.
 P., et al. (2015). Experimental nutrient additions accelerate terrestrial carbon loss from
 stream ecosystems. *Science*, *347*(6226), 1142–1145.
 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1958
- Schade, J. D., Macneill, K., Thomas, S. A., Camille Mcneely, F., Welter, J. R., Hood, J., et al.
 (2011). The stoichiometry of nitrogen and phosphorus spiralling in heterotrophic and
 autotrophic streams. *Freshwater Biology*, *56*(3), 424–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.13652427.2010.02509.x
- Sinsabaugh, R. L., Hill, B. H., & Follstad Shah, J. J. (2009). Ecoenzymatic stoichiometry of
 microbial organic nutrient acquisition in soil and sediment. *Nature*, 462(7274), 795–798.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08632
- Sutfin, N. A., Wohl, E. E., & Dwire, K. A. (2016). Banking carbon: A review of organic carbon
 storage and physical factors influencing retention in floodplains and riparian ecosystems.
 Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, *41*(1), 38–60. https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.3857
- Tank, J. L., Rosi-Marshall, E. J., Griffiths, N. A., Entrekin, S. A., & Stephen, M. L. (2010). A
 review of allochthonous organic matter dynamics and metabolism in streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, *29*(1), 118–146. https://doi.org/10.1899/08-170.1
- Tiegs, S. D., Clapcott, J. E., Griffiths, N. A., & Boulton, A. J. (2013). A standardized cotton-strip
 assay for measuring organic-matter decomposition in streams. *Ecological Indicators*, *32*,
 131–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.03.013
- Tiegs, S. D., Costello, D. M., Isken, M. W., Woodward, G., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., et
 al. (2019). Global patterns and drivers of ecosystem functioning in rivers and riparian zones.
 Science Advances, 5(1), eaav0486. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav0486
- Vitousek, P. M., & Hobbie, S. (2000). Heterotrophic nitrogen fixation in decomposing litter:
 Patterns and regulation. *Ecology*, *81*(9), 2366–2376. https://doi.org/10.1890/00129658(2000)081[2366:HNFIDL]2.0.CO;2
- Webster, J. R., & Benfield, E. F. (1986). Vascular plant breakdown in freshwater ecosystems.
 Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, *17*, 567–594.
- Woodward, G., Gessner, M. O., Giller, P. S., Gulis, V., Hladyz, S., Lecerf, A., et al. (2012).
 Continental-scale effects of nutrient pollution on stream ecosystem functioning. *Science*,
 336(6087), 1438–1440. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1219534
- Yin, R., Eisenhauer, N., Auge, H., Purahong, W., Schmidt, A., & Schädler, M. (2019). Additive
 effects of experimental climate change and land use on faunal contribution to litter
 decomposition. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *131*, 141–148.
- 766 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.01.009

767 **References from the Supporting Information**

- Benfield, E. F. (1997). Comparison of litterfall input to streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, *16*(1), 104–108.
- Mahowald, N., Jickells, T. D., Baker, A. R., Artaxo, P., Benitez-Nelson, C. R., Bergametti, G., et
 al. (2008). Global distribution of atmospheric phosphorus sources, concentrations and
 deposition rates, and anthropogenic impacts. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22(4), 1–19.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GB003240
- Martínez-Yrízar, A., Núñez, S., Miranda, H., & Búrquez, A. (1999). Temporal and spatial
 variation of litter production in Sonoran Desert communities. *Plant Ecology*, *145*(1), 37–48.
 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009896201047
- McDowell, R. W., Noble, A., Pletnyakov, P., Haggard, B. E., & Mosley, L. M. (2020). Global
 mapping of freshwater nutrient enrichment and periphyton growth potential. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60279-w
- Olson, D. M., Dinerstein, E., Wikramanayake, E. D., Burgess, N. D., Powell, G. V. N.,
 Underwood, E. C., et al. (2001). Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: A new map of life on
 earth. *BioScience*, 51(11), 933–938.
- Pozo, J., González, E., Díez, J. R., Molinero, J., & Elósegui, A. (1997). Inputs of particulate
 organic matter to streams with different riparian vegetation. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, *16*(3), 602–611. https://doi.org/10.2307/1468147
- Rotundo, J. L., & Aguiar, M. R. (2005). Litter effects on plant regeneration in arid lands: a
 complex balance between seed retention, seed longevity and soil-seed contact. *Journal of Ecology*, 93(4), 829–838. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2005.01022.x
- Tonin, A. M., Boyero, L., Bambi, P., Pearson, R. G., Correa-Araneda, F., & Gonçalves Jr., J. F.
 (2020). High within-stream replication is needed to predict litter fluxes in wet–dry tropical
 streams. *Freshwater Biology*, 65(4), 688–697. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13459
- Velez-Ruiz, A. M., Nevescanin-Moreno, L., Vargas-Terminel, M. L., Flores-Espinoza, A. R.,
 Álvarez-Yépiz, J. C., & Yépez, E. A. (2020). Data on litterfall production and meteorology
 at an old-growth tropical dry forest in northwestern Mexico. *Data in Brief*, *31*, 105723.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.105723
- Vitousek, P. M., Porder, S., Houlton, B. Z., & Chadwick, O. A. (2010). Terrestrial phosphorus
 limitation: Mechanisms, implications, and nitrogen-phosphorus interactions. *Ecological Applications*, 20(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-0127.1