

1 **Editor summary:**

2 In global drylands, soils tend to be more fertile beneath tree, shrub and grass islands.
 3 Soil fertility was greater beneath taller and wider plants, but was unaffected by either
 4 grazing pressure or the type of herbivore.

5 **Peer review information:**

6 Nature Plants thanks the anonymous reviewers for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

7

Item	Present?	Filename Whole original file name including extension. i.e.: Smith_SI.pdf. The extension must be .pdf	A brief, numerical description of file contents. i.e.: <i>Supplementary Figures 1-4, Supplementary Discussion, and Supplementary Tables 1-4.</i>
Supplementary Information	Yes	7_NPLANTS-230715249_Eldridge et al_Supplementary Information.pdf	This PDF file includes: Supplementary Tables S1 to S3 Supplementary Figures S1 to S8 Supplementary Text S1 to S3 Supplementary References
Reporting Summary	Yes	Ding_RS flat.pdf	
Peer Review Information	No	OFFICE USE ONLY	

8

9

Parent Figure or Table	Filename Whole original file name including extension. i.e.: <i>Smith_SourceData_Fig1.xls</i> , or <i>Smith_Unmodified_Gels_Fig1.pdf</i>	Data description i.e.: Unprocessed western Blots and/or gels, Statistical Source Data, etc.
Source Data Fig. 1	NPLANTS-230715249_Eldridge et al_SourceData_Fig.1.xlsx	Source Data Figure 1
Source Data Fig. 2	NPLANTS-230715249_Eldridge et al_SourceData_Fig.2.xlsx	Source Data Figure 2
Source Data Fig. 3	NPLANTS-230715249_Eldridge et al_SourceData_Fig.3.xlsx	Source Data Figure 3
Source Data Fig. 4	NPLANTS-230715249_Eldridge et al_SourceData_Fig.4.xlsx	Source Data Figure 4

Hotspots of biogeochemical activity linked to aridity and plant traits across global drylands

David J. Eldridge¹, Jingyi Ding², Josh Dorrough^{3,4}, Manuel Delgado-Baquerizo⁵, Osvaldo Sala⁶, Nicolas Gross⁷, Yoann Le Bagousse-Pinguet⁸, Max Mallen-Cooper⁹, Hugo Saiz¹⁰, Sergio Asensio¹¹, Victoria Ochoa¹², Beatriz Gozalo¹¹, Emilio Guirado¹¹, Miguel García-Gómez¹³, Enrique Valencia¹⁴, Jaime Martínez-Valderrama^{11,15}, César Plaza¹², Mehdi Abedi¹⁶, Negar Ahmadian¹⁶, Rodrigo J. Ahumada¹⁷, Julio M. Alcántara¹⁸, Fateh Amghar¹⁹, Luísa Azevedo²⁰, Farah Ben Salem²¹, Miguel Berdugo^{14,22}, Niels Blaum²³, Bazartseren Boldgiv²⁴, Matthew Bowker^{25,26}, Donaldo Bran²⁷, Chongfeng Bu^{28,29}, Raffaella Canessa^{30,31,35}, Andrea P. Castillo-Monroy³², Ignacio Castro³³, Patricio Castro-Quezada³⁴, Simone Cesarz^{35,36}, Roukaya Chibani²¹, Abel Augusto Conceição³⁷, Anthony Darrouzet-Nardi³⁸, Yvonne C. Davila³⁹, Balázs Deák⁴⁰, Paloma Díaz-Martínez¹², David A. Donoso³², Andrew David Dougill⁴¹, Jorge Durán⁴², Nico Eisenhauer^{35,36}, Hamid Ejtehadi⁴³, Carlos Ivan Espinosa⁴⁴, Alex Fajardo⁴⁵, Mohammad Farzam⁴⁶, Ana Foronda⁴⁷, Jorgelina Franzese⁴⁸, Lauchlan H. Fraser⁴⁹, Juan Gaitán⁵⁰, Katja Geissler²³, Sofía Laura Gonzalez⁵¹, Elizabeth Gusman-Montalvan⁴⁴, Rosa Mary Hernández³³, Norbert Hölzel⁵², Frederic Mendes Hughes³⁷, Oswaldo Jadan³⁴, Anke Jentsch⁵³, Mengchen Ju²⁹, Kudzai F. Kaseke⁵⁴, Melanie Köbel⁵⁵, Anika Lehmann⁵⁶, Pierre Liancourt³⁰, Anja Linstädter⁵⁷, Michelle A Louw⁵⁸, Quanhui Ma⁵⁹, Mancha Mabaso⁶⁰, Gillian Maggs-Köling⁶¹, Thulani P. Makhalanyane⁶⁰, Oumarou Malam Issa⁶², Eugene Marais⁶¹, Mitchel McClaran⁶³, Betty Mendoza⁶⁴, Vincent Mokoka⁶⁵, Juan P. Mora⁴⁵, Gerardo Moreno⁶⁶, Seth Munson⁶⁷, Alice Nunes⁵⁵, Gabriel Oliva²⁷, Gastón R Oñatibia⁶⁸, Brooke Osborne⁶⁹, Guadalupe Peter⁷⁰, Margerie Pierre⁷¹, Yolanda Pueyo⁷², R. Emiliano Quiroga¹⁷, Sasha Reed⁷³, Ana Rey⁷⁴, Pedro Rey¹⁸, Víctor Manuel Reyes Gómez⁷⁵, Víctor Rolo⁶⁶, Matthias C. Rillig⁷⁶, Peter C. le Roux⁵⁸, Jan Christian Ruppert³⁰, Ayman Salah⁷⁷, Phokgedi Julius Sebei⁷⁸, Anarmaa Sharkhuu²⁴, Ilan Stavi⁷⁹, Colton Stephens⁴⁹, Alberto L. Teixido¹⁴, Andrew David Thomas⁸⁰, Katja Tielbörger³⁰, Silvia Torres Robles⁷⁰, Samantha Travers¹, Orsolya Valkó⁴⁰, Liesbeth van den Brink³⁰, Frederike Velbert⁵², Andreas von Heßberg⁵³, Wanyoike Wamiti⁸¹, Deli Wang⁵⁹, Lixin Wang⁸², Glenda M. Wardle⁸³, Laura Yahdjian⁸⁴, Eli Zaady⁸⁵, Yuanming Zhang⁸⁶, Xiaobing Zhou⁸⁶, Fernando T. Maestre⁸⁷

Corresponding author: Jingyi Ding, email: jingyiding@bnu.edu.cn

State Key Laboratory of Earth Surface Processes and Resource Ecology, Faculty of Geographical Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

Affiliations

¹Centre for Ecosystem Science, School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, 2052, Australia

- 52 ²State Key Laboratory of Earth Surface Processes and Resource Ecology, Faculty of
53 Geographical Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China
- 54 ³Department of Planning and Environment, PO Box 656, Merimbula NSW 2548,
55 Australia
- 56 ⁴Fenner School of Environment & Society, Australian National University, Canberra,
57 2601, Australia
- 58 ⁵Laboratorio de Biodiversidad y Funcionamiento Ecosistémico. Instituto de Recursos
59 Naturales y Agrobiología de Sevilla (IRNAS), CSIC, 41012, Sevilla, Spain
- 60 ⁶Schools of Life Sciences, School of Sustainability, and Global Drylands Center,
61 Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287
- 62 ⁷Université Clermont Auvergne, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, Unité Mixte de Recherche
63 Ecosystème Prairial; Clermont-Ferrand, France
- 64 ⁸Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, Avignon Université, IRD, IMBE; Aix-en-Provence,
65 France
- 66 ⁹Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural
67 Sciences (SLU), Umeå, Sweden
- 68 ¹⁰ Departamento de Ciencias Agrarias y Medio Natural, Escuela Politécnica Superior,
69 Instituto Universitario de Investigación en Ciencias Ambientales de Aragón (IUCA),
70 Universidad de Zaragoza, Huesca, Spain.
- 71 ¹¹Instituto Multidisciplinar para el Estudio del Medio “Ramón Margalef”, Universidad
72 de Alicante, Alicante, Spain
- 73 ¹²Instituto de Ciencias Agrarias, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,
74 Madrid, Spain
- 75 ¹³Departamento de Ingeniería y Morfología del Terreno, Escuela Técnica Superior de
76 Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid,
77 Madrid, Spain
- 78 ¹⁴Departamento de Biodiversidad, Ecología y Evolución, Facultad de Ciencias
79 Biológicas. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040, Madrid, Spain
- 80 ¹⁵Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas (EEZA), CSIC, Campus UAL. Carretera de
81 Sacramento s/n 04120, La Cañada de San Urbano, Almería, Spain
- 82 ¹⁶Department of Range Management, Faculty of Natural Resources and Marine
83 Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University, Noor, Iran
- 84 ¹⁷Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria, Estación Experimental
85 Agropecuaria Catamarca, 4700 Catamarca, Argentina
- 86 ¹⁸Instituto Interuniversitario de Investigación del Sistema Tierra de Andalucía,
87 Universidad de Jaén, E-23071 Jaén, Spain

- 88 ¹⁹Laboratoire Biodiversité, Biotechnologie, Environnement et Développement
89 Durable (Biodev), Université M'hamed Bougara de Boumerdès, Avenue de
90 l'indépendance 35000 Boumerdès, Algérie
- 91 ²⁰Departamento de Genética, Ecologia e Evolução, Universidade Federal de Minas
92 Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, 31270-901, Brazil
- 93 ²¹Laboratory of Eremology and Combating Desertification (LR16IRA01), IRA,
94 Institut des Régions Arides Medenine, Tunisia
- 95 ²²Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.
- 96 ²³Plant Ecology and Nature Conservation, University of Potsdam, Am Mühlenberg 3,
97 14476 Potsdam, Germany
- 98 ²⁴Laboratory of Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis, Department of Biology,
99 School of Arts and Sciences, National University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar 14201,
100 Mongolia.
- 101 ²⁵School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University, Arizona, USA
- 102 ²⁶Center for Ecosystem Science and Society, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff,
103 Arizona, USA
- 104 ²⁷Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA), Estación Experimental
105 Agropecuaria Bariloche, Bariloche, Río Negro, Argentina
- 106 ²⁸Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Northwest A & F University, Yangling,
107 Shaanxi 712100, China
- 108 ²⁹Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences and
109 Ministry of Water Resources, Yangling, Shaanxi, 712100, China
- 110 ³⁰State Museum of Natural History Stuttgart, Rosenstein 1, 70191 Stuttgart, Germany
- 111 ³¹Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany
- 112 ³²Grupo de Investigación en Ecología Evolutiva en los Trópicos-EETROP-
113 Universidad de las Américas, Quito, Ecuador
- 114 ³³Universidad Simón Rodríguez. Instituto de Estudios Científicos y Tecnológicos
115 (IDECYT),
- 116 ³⁴Grupo de Ecología Forestal y Agroecosistemas, Facultad de Ciencias
117 Agropecuarias, Carrera de Agronomía, Universidad de Cuenca, Ecuador
- 118 ³⁵German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig;
119 Leipzig, Germany
- 120 ³⁶Leipzig University, Institute of Biology; Leipzig, Germany
- 121 ³⁷Departamento de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana,
122 Biológicas, Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana, Feira de Santana, Bahia,
123 Brazil
- 124 ³⁸Department of Biological Sciences, University of Texas at El Paso, Texas, USA

- 125 ³⁹Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney New South Wales
126 2007, Australia
- 127 ⁴⁰HUN-REN 'Lendület' Seed Ecology Research Group, Institute of Ecology and
128 Botany, Centre for Ecological Research, Vácrátót, H-2163, Hungary
- 129 ⁴¹University of York, UK.
- 130 ⁴²Misión Biológica de Galicia, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,
131 Pontevedra, Spain
- 132 ⁴³Faculty of Science, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
- 133 ⁴⁴Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja; Loja,
134 Ecuador.
- 135 ⁴⁵ Instituto de Investigación Interdisciplinaria (I3), Vicerrectoría Académica,
136 Universidad de Talca, Chile.
- 137 ⁴⁶Department of Range and Watershed Management, Faculty of Natural Resources
138 and Environment, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- 139 ⁴⁷Veterinary Faculty, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain
- 140 ⁴⁸Investigaciones de Ecología en Ambientes Antropizados, Laboratorio Ecotono,
141 INIBIOMA (Universidad Nacional del Comahue, CONICET), Bariloche 8400, Río
142 Negro, Argentina.
- 143 ⁴⁹Department of Natural Resource Science, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops,
144 BC, V2C 0C8, Canada
- 145 ⁵⁰Universidad Nacional de Luján-CONICET. Luján, Argentina.
- 146 ⁵¹Instituto de Investigaciones en Biodiversidad y Medioambiente (CONICET),
147 Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Argentina
- 148 ⁵²Institute of Landscape Ecology, University of Münster, Heisenbergstr. 2, 48149
149 Münster, Germany
- 150 ⁵³Disturbance Ecology and Vegetation Dynamics, Bayreuth Center of Ecology and
151 Environmental Research (BayCEER), University of Bayreuth, Universitaetsstrasse 30,
152 95440 Bayreuth, Germany
- 153 ⁵⁴Earth Research Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
- 154 ⁵⁵cE3c - Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes & CHANGE -
155 Global Change and Sustainability Institute, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de
156 Lisboa, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal
- 157 ⁵⁶Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced Biodiversity Research (BBIB), Berlin,
158 Germany
- 159 ⁵⁷University of Potsdam, Biodiversity Research / Systematic Botany, Potsdam,
160 Germany
- 161 ⁵⁸Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Pretoria, South Africa

162 ⁵⁹Key Laboratory of Vegetation Ecology of the Ministry of Education, Jilin Songnen
163 Grassland Ecosystem National Observation and Research Station, Institute of
164 Grassland Science, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, China

165 ⁶⁰Department of Biochemistry, Genetics and Microbiology, DSI/NRF SARChI in
166 Marine Microbiomics, University of Pretoria, Hatfield, Lynnwood Road, Pretoria,
167 South Africa, 0029

168 ⁶¹Gobabeb – Namib Research Institute, Walvis Bay, Namibia

169 ⁶²Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences of Paris,
170 SU/IRD/CNRS/INRAE/UPEC, Bondy, France

171 ⁶³School of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Arizona, Tucson,
172 AZ, USA

173 ⁶⁴Departamento de Biología y Geología, Física y Química Inorgánica, Universidad
174 Rey Juan Carlos; Móstoles, Spain

175 ⁶⁵Risk and Vulnerability Science Centre, University of Limpopo, South Africa

176 ⁶⁶INDEHESA, Forestry School, Universidad de Extremadura, Plasencia 10600, Spain

177 ⁶⁷U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Flagstaff, Arizona,
178 USA

179 ⁶⁸Instituto de Investigaciones Fisiológicas y Ecológicas Vinculadas a la Agricultura
180 (IFEVA-CONICET), Cátedra de Ecología, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de
181 Buenos Aires, C1418DSE Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

182 ⁶⁹Department of Environment and Society, Utah State University, Moab, UT, USA

183 ⁷⁰Universidad Nacional de Río Negro, Sede Atlántica, Centro de Estudios
184 Ambientales desde la NorPatagonia (CEANPa). Viedma, Río Negro, Argentina. -
185 CONICET

186 ⁷¹Normandie Universite, Unirouen, Inrae, Ecodiv, 76000 Rouen, France.

187 ⁷²Instituto Pirenaico de Ecología (IPE, CSIC), Zaragoza, Spain

188 ⁷³U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Moab, Utah, USA

189 ⁷⁴Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones
190 Científicas; Madrid, Spain

191 ⁷⁵Instituto de Ecología, A.C. Chihuahua, Chihuahua, Mexico

192 ⁷⁶Institute of Biology, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

193 ⁷⁷Al Quds University, Abu Dis, Palestine.

194 ⁷⁸Mara Research Station, Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Rural
195 Development, Makhado, 0920, South Africa

196 ⁷⁹The Dead Sea and Arava Science Center, Yotvata, 88820, Israel, and Eilat Campus,
197 Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat 88100, Israel

198 ⁸⁰Department of Geography and Earth Science, Aberystwyth University, Wales, UK.

199 ⁸¹Zoology Department, National Museums of Kenya, P.O. Box 40658-00100,
200 Nairobi, Kenya.

201 ⁸²Department of Earth Sciences, Indiana University Indianapolis (IUI), Indianapolis,
202 Indiana 46202, USA

203 ⁸³Desert Ecology Research Group, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, The
204 University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia

205 ⁸⁴Cátedra de Ecología, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
206 Instituto de Investigaciones Fisiológicas y Ecológicas Vinculadas a la Agricultura
207 (IFEVA-CONICET); Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

208 ⁸⁵Department of Natural Resources, Agricultural Research Organization, Institute of
209 Plant Sciences, Gilat Research Center, Israel, and Kaye College of Education, Be'er
210 Sheva, Israel

211 ⁸⁶State Key Laboratory of Desert and Oasis Ecology, Xinjiang Institute of Ecology
212 and Geography, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Urumqi 830011, China.

213 ⁸⁷Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Biological and Environmental Science
214 and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology,
215 Thuwal, 23955-6900, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Abstract

Perennial plants create productive and biodiverse hotspots, known as fertile islands, beneath their canopies. These hotspots largely determine the structure and functioning of drylands worldwide. Despite their ubiquity, the factors controlling fertile islands under conditions of contrasting grazing by livestock, the most prevalent land use in drylands, remain virtually unknown. We evaluated the relative importance of grazing pressure and herbivore type, climate, and plant functional traits on 24 soil physical and chemical attributes that represent proxies of key ecosystem services related to decomposition, soil fertility, and soil and water conservation. To do this we conducted a standardized global survey of 288 plots at 88 sites in 25 countries worldwide. We show that aridity and plant traits are the major factors associated with the magnitude of plant effects on fertile islands in grazed drylands worldwide. Grazing pressure had little influence on the capacity of plants to support fertile islands. Taller and wider shrubs and grasses supported stronger island effects. Stable and functional soils tended to be linked to species-rich sites with taller plants. Together, our findings dispel the notion that grazing pressure or herbivore type are linked to the formation or intensification of fertile islands in drylands. Rather, our study suggests that changes in aridity, and processes that alter island identity and therefore plant traits, will have marked effects on how perennial plants support and maintain the functioning of drylands in a more arid and grazed world.

Keywords: carbon sequestration, drylands, decomposition, fertile patch, soil fertility, soil condition, soil health, soil stability

Introduction

Drylands are characterized by a sparse plant cover, with patches of perennial plants nested within an ocean of unvegetated bare soil^{1,2}. These plant patches and the enriched soil beneath their canopies, act as biogeochemical hotspots, critical for the maintenance of plant and animal diversity, and essential functions and services related to nutrient mineralisation and storage, and water regulation^{1,3,4}. Dryland vegetation, and the “fertile islands” they create, are predicted to be affected by livestock grazing, the most pervasive land use in drylands⁵. Overgrazing by livestock and wild (native) herbivores is known to alter surface soils, suppress the infiltration of water, and increase runoff water and sediment discharge^{6,7}, potentially intensifying the fertile island effect by exacerbating the loss of resources from the interspaces and its supplementation in nearby islands⁸. Yet, there is little support for this notion, other than studies showing that overgrazing leads to a greater relative effect of woody island soils over interspace soils, but that severe overgrazing leads to total collapse⁹. Globally, there is little empirical support for the putative importance of grazing as a causal agent of the fertile island effect^{10,11}, particularly when considering the wide range of plant types characterizing drylands, from grasses to shrubs and trees. This makes it difficult to disentangle grazing effects from the inherent effects of those plants that form the islands. This is an important knowledge gap, as predicted declines in rainfall, changes in the structure of island plants, and forecasted increases of grazing over the next century will likely place increasing pressure on drylands and their perennial components, compromising their ability to sustain livestock, people, and their cultures¹².

Yet, despite the extensive body of knowledge dedicated to their study, the relative importance of grazing, climate, and the traits of the focal island species on the distribution and magnitude of fertile islands across global drylands remains virtually unknown. To address this knowledge gap, we assess, for the first time, the relative association between grazing, plant traits, climate and soil properties, and fertile islands in grazed drylands worldwide. This improves our ability to predict the future of dryland biodiversity and function, and can improve the management of perennial vegetation, particularly as grasslands are likely to contract and woody dominated systems increase in a drier and more heavily grazed world^{8,13}.

We examined the fertile island effect by comparing 24 soil physical, chemical and functional attributes beneath the canopy of perennial vegetation compared with their adjacent unvegetated interspaces across global drylands. The 24 attributes were assembled into three synthetic functions that represent the capacity of soils to mineralise organic matter (Decomposition), enhance fertility (Fertility), and conserve water and maintain stability (Conservation, see Methods). We gathered data from 288 dryland sites across 25 countries on six continents (Fig. 1) to test the following two contrasting hypotheses. First, we expected that the magnitude of the fertile island effect would increase with increasing levels of both recent (standardised dung mass) and long-term or historic (heuristic assessment; ungrazed to high) grazing pressure (Hypothesis 1a). This prediction is based on the understanding that greater grazing

pressure will destabilise surface soils, mobilising sediment, seed, nutrients, and organic matter from unvegetated interspaces to plant patches, strengthening fertile islands^{14,15}. Additionally, livestock might be expected to have a greater effect than wild herbivores because they have not co-evolved with indigenous vegetation and therefore have more deleterious effects on both island plants and their soils⁶, Hypothesis 1b). Alternatively, changes in climate and plant traits, factors that operate at much larger (regional and global) scales, could overwhelm the impacts of grazing, a factor that operates at the local scale, on fertile islands (Hypothesis 2a). More specifically, irrespective of grazing pressure, we would expect that plants would make a greater contribution to fertile islands in arid and hyper-arid ecosystems where soils are extremely bare and infertile compared with less arid ecosystems where the influence of plants would be relatively lower. For example, reduced rainfall and/or increased temperature would increase the harshness of the interspaces compared with the vegetated and more protected islands, thereby strengthening the fertile island effect. Plant effects might also be expected to vary among broad functional groups (tree vs shrub vs grass; Hypothesis 2b). These broad groups could have varying effects on soil biogeochemistry because of marked differences in shape, size, and structural complexity. Quantifying the contribution of grazing by different herbivores at different pressures, plant traits, climate, and soil properties on fertile islands allowed us to assess current and future impacts of grazing on ecosystem structure and functioning across global drylands, where woody vegetation is a predominant plant form¹².

Results and Discussion

We found stronger associations among factors such as aridity and plant traits (Hypothesis 2) than factors such as grazing pressure (Hypothesis 1a) and herbivore identity (Hypothesis 1b) and the fertile island effect in drylands worldwide. This knowledge is key to contextualise the ecosystem consequences of increased livestock grazing pressure on the capacity of plants to create and maintain hotspots of biogeochemical activity.

Global fertile island effects

Prior to exploring potential effects of grazing, plant traits, or environmental conditions, we examined the RII relationships of the 24 attributes distributed among the three synthetic functions. This exploration gives us a better understanding of how individual biogeochemical attributes and their three synthetic ecosystem functions might differ between islands and their interspaces (the fertile island effect). We found strong empirical evidence of a pervasive fertile island effect across all sites and continents and for 16 (67%) of the 24 attributes (Fig. 2). Our results are consistent with findings from empirical local studies revealing greater resource accumulation beneath perennial plant canopies for attributes as diverse as soil geochemistry^{11,13,16,17}, soil physical properties⁹, hydrology^{18,19} and microbial community structure⁴. Of all possible effects, the Decomposition function (which comprised C, N and P

mineralisation), was the most strongly developed function within the islands (Fig. 2), likely due to greater litter inputs^{4,20}, microbial activity and plant biomass²¹ beneath perennial plant canopies^{22,23}. The fertile island effect for the other functions was mixed, with strong positive effects for C, and to a lesser extent P, but not for micronutrients (Fig. 2). The fertile island effect for C and N was also greater in more arid drylands. These findings reinforce the view that perennial plant patches are hotspots of biological activity in drylands⁴, and this likely accounts for their potential role as facilitators of protégé plant species through resource supplementation²⁴.

The influence of grazing, island type and plant traits

We then sought to quantify the importance of potential associations among measures of grazing and fertile islands. Using hierarchical linear mixed modelling (see Methods) we found no consistent influence of grazing, either recent (standardized grazing pressure) or long-term (ungrazed, low, medium, high) grazing pressure on the mean (overall) fertile island effect (the average standardized value of all 24 attributes shown in Table S1 in Supplementary Information). We also found a consistent, but extremely weak negative effect of recent grazing pressure on Decomposition, contrary to the results of global meta-analyses²⁵. There were no significant effects of increasing recent grazing pressure on either the Fertility or Conservation function (Fig. 3a, Table S2). There were no significant effects of long-term (historic) grazing pressure (ungrazed, low, medium, high) on any measures (Fig. S1, Table S2).

Of all effects, aridity was by far the strongest (Table S2), with a strong positive effect on the Decomposition function, weak effects on the Fertility, but no effect on the Conservation function (Fig. S3a, Table S2). Although the effects of island type (tree, shrub, grass) were minor compared with the large aridity effect, we did identify some trends. For example, there were consistent positive, though weak, fertile island effects beneath shrubs, and to a lesser extent trees, irrespective of grazing pressure. The only other noteworthy grazing-related effect was the negative interaction between shrubs, and to a lesser extent trees, and mixed herbivores (Table S2).

Our results provide fresh insights into the links between grazing and fertile islands, demonstrating that, across global drylands, grazing cannot be considered a causal agent of the fertile island effect. Thus, placed in a global context, the local influence of grazing on fertile islands is overshadowed by global environmental variability. This result challenges the view of fertile islands and their formation, which posits that islands are a byproduct of grazing¹¹. This view has largely been shaped by studies from the Chihuahuan Desert in the western United States where increases in woody plant (generally shrub) density are linked to a dominance of woody plant islands and ensuing desertification²⁶. Undoubtedly, grazing-induced disturbance can aggravate differences between perennial plants and their interspaces in some situations by disturbing interspaces and intensifying the movement of resources from interspace to island patches²⁷. However, neither short- nor long-term grazing pressure, nor herbivore type, were associated with the fertile island effect under the conditions experienced across our extensive global dryland survey.

Given the importance of plant traits, a Random Forest algorithm was then used to examine the degree to which a comprehensive suite of 15 functional traits of island woody plant species explained differences in the fertile island effect for the three synthetic functions studied. These traits, which are related to plant size and structure, leaf characteristics, and the ability to respond to environmental stimuli (palatability, resprouting, deciduousness, allelopathy, see Methods) potentially influence the way nutrients are stored, mineralized, and made available to plants, and how soil and water are conserved beneath plant canopies²⁸. Our trait data, which represent the most comprehensive dataset gathered to date across global drylands, were used to evaluate the relative importance of island plant structure. We used site-specific trait values rather than global averages, allowing us to account for potential differences in the morphology of island plants under different grazing pressure, herbivore type and environmental conditions. The extent to which different plant traits affected the three synthetic functions varied depending on the function considered (Fig. S4 in Supplementary Information). We found that the relative fertile effect for our three synthetic functions was generally greater when the islands were dominated by taller and wider plants, and to a lesser extent, by plants with larger leaves. Plant height was important for all functions, while the Decomposition function responded mostly to plant and leaf size, and the Fertility function was driven mostly by changes in plant size and leaf characteristics (Fig. S4 in Supplementary Information).

Direct and indirect drivers of the fertile island effect

We then used Structural Equation Modelling²⁹ to explore potential associations among biotic and abiotic factors and the fertile island effect. Our *a priori* model (Fig. S5 in Supplementary Information) included environmental drivers (aridity, temperature, rainfall seasonality), soil (sand content, pH) and vegetation (perennial plant richness, relative cover of woody plants) properties, plant traits (the nine most important plant traits related to size, leaf characteristics, and inherent properties of woody plants such as the type of roots or whether they are allelopathic; identified using the Random Forest analyses, see Methods), and grazing (recent grazing, long-term grazing, and herbivore type). Grazing was included to test its potential indirect effects on the relative fertile island effect for the three soil functions evaluated. Our models revealed that decomposition was enhanced in areas of greater aridity (consistent with the hierarchical linear modelling, though not for carbon mineralisation, Fig. S2 Supplementary Information), more sandy soils, and where focal island species were more palatable (Fig. 4; Fig. S6 Supplementary Information). Fertility tended to be greater in sandy soils and with taller palatable species. Soils with larger values of the Conservation function (more stable, with greater water holding capacity) tended to be associated with taller island plants, potentially through mechanisms involving hydraulic lift³⁰, and at plots supporting more perennial plant species (Fig. S6 Supplementary Information). A potential explanation for the link between the Conservation function, and both plant height and richness could relate to a greater leaf area³¹ of larger island plants and therefore reduced surface evaporation³². After accounting for all direct and indirect pathways from both abiotic and biotic

factors, our SEMs confirm that grazing had no effects on the three functions evaluated.

Among plant traits, plant size (height and canopy) was particularly important, with larger canopies associated with greater RII values of all three functions (but only for grasses), and taller grasses with greater RII values of the Decomposition function (Fig. S7 in Supplementary Information). Larger grasses are functionally more efficient at capturing resources³³ and enhancing hydrological functions^{34,35} and may be a response to declining landscape productivity³⁶. Larger plants may be avoided more by herbivores due to higher concentrations of tannins and secondary compounds³⁷. Similarly, taller shrubs were associated with larger values of the Conservation and Fertility, but not Decomposition, functions (Fig. S7 in Supplementary Information). Taller shrubs would return more litter to the soil surface³⁸, provide more varied habitat³⁹ and concentrate more resources excreted by canopy-resident invertebrates⁴⁰, potentially accounting for greater fertility²⁰. Finally, larger shrubs would support a greater density of understorey protégé species⁴¹ and have a larger legacy effect on soils after death⁴². Interestingly, trees with larger canopies were associated with lower values of the Decomposition and Conservation functions (Fig. S7 in Supplementary Information). Large tree canopies are often preferred camping sites for herbivores³⁹, leading to declines in soil structure⁴³, and reductions in soil water holding capacity due to the proliferation of surface roots. Our results could suggest a waning of the fertile island effect under large trees.

Overall, our work provides solid evidence that factors such as climate and plant traits can overshadow the influence of factors such as grazing pressure on the capacity of plants to create fertile islands across global drylands. Our findings indicate that fertile islands will prevail in more arid environments regardless of grazing pressure and the composition of herbivores. In these environments, fertile islands sustain healthy and functional soils, moderate adverse environmental conditions, and provides refugia for plants and animals. Our results dispel the long-term assumption that increasing grazing pressure, either recent or longer term, or differences in herbivore type, can explain the magnitude of fertile island effects in drylands. Plant size, with taller and wider shrubs and grasses, supported stronger island effects. Stable and functional soils were also linked to species-rich sites with taller plants. The overwhelming importance of aridity and plant traits suggests that fertile islands may represent an autogenic response to drying and warming climates. These biogeochemical hotspots are likely to be more important as Earth's climate becomes hotter and drier.

Methods

Study area

We surveyed 288 plots at 88 sites in 25 countries on all continents except Antarctica (Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Ecuador, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Niger,

Palestine, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, and United States of America, Fig. 1). We used the sites described in ref. 12, but excluded 10 sites that did not have sufficient trait data (see below). Site selection aimed to capture as much as possible of the wide variety of abiotic (climate, soil type, slope) and biotic (vegetation type, cover and species richness) features characterizing dryland ecosystems (e.g., grasslands, shrublands, savannas, open woodlands) found in drylands worldwide^{12,44}. Elevation varied between 12 m and 2214 m a.s.l, and slope from 0° to 31.6°. The surveyed sites encompassed a wide variety of the representative vegetation physiognomies, including grasslands, shrublands, savannas and open woodlands (Fig. 1) found in drylands. Sites were surveyed between January 2016 and September 2019^{12,44}.

Establishing and defining local grazing gradients

At each of the 88 sites, multiple 45 m x 45 m plots were sampled across a gradient in grazing pressure that was determined by local experts and compared with dung counts, livestock tracks, and livestock density data when available. Plots were selected from grazing gradients (distance to water measured using GIS) or specific paddocks that represented ungrazed, low, medium, or high levels of known grazing pressure. Thirty-five percent of sites had an ungrazed plot (e.g., an enclosure). All plots were established in areas representative of the vegetation and soil types found, so the impacts of grazing pressure could be assessed at each site without confounding factors associated with differences in climate, soil type or vegetation.

Field surveyors, who were all intimately associated with the long-term grazing history of these sites, characterised their plots using this four-scale heuristic category (ungrazed, low, moderate, high). Grazing pressure gradients were confirmed by measuring the mass of herbivore dung *in situ*⁶. Dung production is known to be closely linked to animal activity, time spent grazing, and therefore grazing pressure^{45,46}, though more studies are needed in arid systems to validate these relationships. To measure dung, we collected the dung of different herbivores from within two 25 m² (where herbivores were large bodied, e.g., cattle, horses, large ungulates) or 1 m² (when herbivores were smaller bodied e.g., goats, sheep, rabbit, guanaco) quadrats⁴⁴. Dung was oven dried and expressed as a mass per area. Where herbivores produced pellets, dung was counted from different herbivores, a subsample collected, and following oven drying, used to calculate the relationship between counts and oven-dry dung mass (Text S1 in Supplementary Information).

The mass of dung from each plot was then used to develop a continuous measure of grazing pressure. Dung mass represents the signature of grazing over periods of one to five years, depending on the presence of detritivores and litter decomposing invertebrates such as termites and dung beetles⁴⁷. Dung decay rates will also likely vary across our sites due to differences in climatic conditions, the presence of exotic invertebrate decomposers, trampling and other factors⁴⁸. Although these differences could potentially alter the amount of dung detected within a plot, this would have minimal impact on our measure of recent grazing pressure given the standardisation process we applied to dung mass across plots within a site.

For each plot, we standardised the value of the mass of dung of all herbivores within a plot by the maximum dung mass at that particular site (collection of plots). Standardized values ranged from 0 to 1 (0.30 ± 0.01 , mean $\pm$ SE) across the 88 sites. A value of 1 for a particular plot indicates that this plot had the greatest grazing pressure for that site and zero was ungrazed. This approach to standardising dung mass within sites ensures the equivalence of sites that might have markedly different levels of dung production, due to variation in site productivity, but have the same level of grazing pressure (e.g., moderate grazing pressure). The method has also been validated multiple times in grazing studies^{49,50}. Across our global study we recorded 29 different herbivore types, of which five were livestock (cattle, goat, sheep, donkey, horse)¹².

Dung mass was a good proxy of grazing pressure using two approaches (see Text S1 in Supplementary Information). First, there was a significant positive relationship between dung mass and livestock density for a subset of sites in Iran, Australia, and Argentina for which we had data on dung mass and animal density¹². Second, we performed a cluster analysis⁵¹ to identify the optimum number of dung-based clusters, based on dung mass, and found that this aligned well with the four heuristic levels of grazing pressure¹².

Third, we linked the four heuristic measures of long-term (decadal to multi-decadal) grazing pressure to the presence of livestock tracks; semi-permanent features created by livestock when they traverse the same path to and from water⁵². The density and size of these tracks is a useful indicator of the history of livestock grazing⁵³. We measured the width and depth of all livestock tracks crossing each of the 45 m transects to derive a total cross-sectional area of tracks for each plot and expressed this as the total track density and cross-sectional area per 100 m of transect (Fig. S8). In summary, these three comprehensive measures of grazing intensity by herbivores showed very similar trends, irrespective of whether we used dung mass as a measure of recent grazing pressure, or the expert heuristic site classification as a measure of long-term grazing pressure. This gives us a high degree of confidence that the gradients we observed are true gradients in grazing pressure.

Vegetation and plant trait measurements

Field surveys followed a standardised sampling protocol⁴⁴. Briefly, within each plot, we located four 45 m transects oriented downslope, spaced 10 m apart across the slope, for the vegetation surveys. Along each 45 m transect we assessed the cover of perennial plants, by species, within 25 contiguous 1.5 m by 1.5 m quadrats. Perennial plants were then recorded every 10 cm along this transect to obtain a measure of perennial plant cover. Total plot-level plant richness was calculated as the total number of unique perennial plant species found within at least one of the survey methods (transects or quadrats) employed. In each site, we measured the height and lateral spread of five randomly selected individuals of the dominant island plants. Lateral spread (canopy width), a proxy of plant area, was assessed by measuring plant diameter in two orthogonal directions through the plant centre. Fresh leaves were

collected from the same plants to assess an additional four plant traits in the laboratory (leaf length, leaf area, and leaf carbon and nitrogen contents). These six traits describe the size and leaf characteristic of the 162 perennial species in the vegetation patch that was dominated by trees, shrubs, or large perennial grasses, and which we assessed as potential fertile islands (see detailed measurements in Text S2 in Supplementary Information). Twenty-three percent of plots supported two co-dominant island species (i.e., two different tree, shrub, or grass species). For these plots, soil biogeochemical and plant trait data were weighted according to the mean cover of the co-dominant species within a plot.

We compiled information on eight additional plant traits (i.e., plant canopy shape, whether foliage reached the ground surface, N-fixation, deciduousness, allelopathy, palatability, resprouting, root type) using information from online plant trait databases such as BROT⁵⁴, PLANTS⁵⁵, Woody Plants Database (<http://woodyplants.cals.cornell.edu>) and TRY⁵⁶. The eight categorical traits above were ranked numerically such that a larger value equated with greater function in terms of its own growth or its facilitatory effect on surrounding neighbours and conditions. This procedure is described in detail in Text S2 in Supplementary Information.

Soil properties and sampling

Soils were sampled during the dry season. In each plot, five sampling points were randomly located in open areas devoid of perennial vascular plants (< 5% plant cover, hereafter ‘open’ microsite), and another five placed beneath the canopy of five randomly selected individuals of the dominant island plant (Text S3 in Supplementary Information). A composite sample of five 145 cm³ soil cores (0-7.5 cm depth) was collected from beneath each plant or bare area, bulked, and homogenized in the field. Soil samples were air-dried for 1 month, sieved (< 2 mm) and stored for physico-chemical analyses. The samples were then bulked to obtain one composite sample per plot for vegetated (island) and a separate composite sample for open areas. All analyses described here are for two composite samples per plot. We assessed soil pH (1:2.5 soil water suspension, sand content⁵⁷, and the values of 24 soil ecological attributes that are linked to three ecosystem functions (Table S1 in Supplementary Information).

Assessment of ecosystem functions

We calculated a relative interaction index (RII) and its 95% confidence interval⁵⁸ for the 24 ecological attributes as measures of the fertile island effect. A positive (or negative) value indicates a greater (or lesser) value of that attribute, respectively, in island soils. The RII is defined as the relative difference between attributes beneath the perennial plant islands and their open interspaces and was calculated as $RII = (X_I - X_O) / (X_I + X_O)$, where X_I and X_O represent the mean values of a given ecological attribute beneath a perennial plant patch (island) and in the open interspace, respectively. Values of the RII range from -1 to 1, with positive values indicating greater levels of a given attribute beneath the island and vice versa. Evidence of the

fertile island effect (either positive or negative) is based on whether the 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs), calculated using ‘Rmisc’ package in R ⁵⁹ cross the zero line.

We focussed on three proxies of function derived from the average RII of different combination of the 24 soil attributes: 1) organic matter decomposition, quantified using the activity of five soil extracellular enzymes related to the degradation of organic matter [β -glucosidase, phosphatase, cellobiosidase, β -N-acetylglucosaminidase and xylase], and measurements of soil carbon (hereafter ‘Decomposition’ (2) soil fertility, evaluated using multiple proxies of soil nutrient availability and carbon (contents of dissolved organic and total N, NH_4^+ , NO_3^- , total P, Mn, K, Zn, Mg, Fe, Cu and soil C, hereafter ‘Fertility’), and 3) resource conservation (water regulation, using measures of soil water holding capacity, soil porosity, stability of macro-aggregates $>250\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and mean weight diameter of soil aggregates (hereafter ‘Conservation’). Detailed measurements on these 24 soil ecological attributes are described in Table S1 in Supplementary Information.

Data compilation and statistical analysis

Rainfall seasonality (coefficient of variation of 12 monthly rainfall totals) data were extracted from the WorldClim Version 2.0 (<http://www.worldclim.org/>) ⁶⁰ database, which provides global climate data ($0^{\circ}30'' \times 0^{\circ}30''$) for the 1970-2000 period. Aridity was identified as precipitation/potential evapotranspiration and was derived from the Global Aridity Index and Potential Evapotranspiration Climate Database v2 aridity database (<https://cgiarcsi.community/2019/01/24/global-aridity-index-and-potential-evapotranspiration-climate-database-v2/>) ⁶¹, which includes global aridity data ($0^{\circ}30'' \times 0^{\circ}30''$) for the 1970-2000 period. Soil texture is a major determinant of water holding capacity and pH is a major driver of plant and soil function in drylands ⁶². Sand content and pH data used in this study were obtained from samples taken from the open areas (to ensure that their effects on the ecosystem functions measured are as independent from those of organisms as possible). Relative woody cover was included to account for different levels of woody plants so that this would not bias any results. Standardized dung mass (dung mass in a plot/maximum dung mass within the site) was used as a measure of recent grazing pressure.

Statistical analyses

We fitted a Bayesian hierarchical linear mixed model to evaluate whether the fertile island effect differed (1) with increasing grazing pressure (continuous data: standardized dung mass), 2) with long-term grazing pressure (categorical data: ungrazed, low, moderate, high grazing), and 3) among herbivore types (categorical data: sites dominated by either livestock, native, or mixed groups of native and livestock). Our RII values were modelled with a Gaussian (normal) distribution, with all individual ecosystem attributes ($n = 24$) estimated simultaneously in a single model. Note that RII values are calculated at the plot level whereas grazing pressure is calculated at the site level. The standardised response variable (RII) was modelled hierarchically as a function of recent grazing pressure (standardised dung), long-term

grazing pressure (high, medium, low, ungrazed), herbivore type (livestock, native, mixed), aridity, island type (tree, shrub, grass), and functional category (Decomposition, Fertility, Conservation). The model fitted individual ecosystem functional attributes as groups (random intercepts) with varying slopes associated with each of the main covariates (grazing and aridity). The model also included interactions between ecosystem function category and grazing, island type, and aridity to account for potential differences in the effects of each covariate within each ecosystem function category. We included site as a random intercept, accounting for the non-independence of data gathered from the same site.

We specified weakly informative normally distributed priors for the intercept and all regression coefficients (mean = 0 and scale = 2.5). Default priors were used for sigma (exponential, rate = 1) and variance-covariance matrix of the varying intercepts and slope parameters (shape and scale of 1). Posterior simulations of model parameters were undertaken using the No-U-Turn Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampler within Stan⁶³. Posterior distributions were estimated from four chains, each with 1000 iterations, after discarding the preliminary 1000 iterations. The convergence of models was assessed using visual diagnostics (autocorrelation, trace plots, and posterior predictive checks) and inspection of effective sample sizes (min. 1000) and $\hat{r}$ values (<1.01). Models were fitted using the package 'rstanarm'⁶⁴ within R⁵⁹. A hierarchical model provides several benefits over simple averaging of standardised indicators or multiple separate models⁶⁵: (i) simultaneous modelling of multiple attributes improves precision and estimates of uncertainty for each ecosystem function category; (ii) non-independence of multiple attributes within sites is explicitly accounted for; (iii) enables simultaneous estimation of overall fertile island effect for each ecosystem functional category and the individual soil attributes within these.

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM²⁹) was employed to explore the direct and indirect impact of climate (aridity [ARID], rainfall seasonality [SEAS]), soil pH (pH), sand content (SAND), vegetation attributes (plot-level perennial plant cover [COV] and plant richness [RICH], plant height [HT], canopy width [WIDTH], shape [SHAPE], leaf length [LNGTH], leaf area [AREA], palatability [PALAT], resprouting [RESP], deciduousness [DECID], and allelopathy [ALLELO]), and grazing (standardised grazing pressure) on the fertile island effect (RII) after accounting for the effects of location (latitude, cosine longitude, sine longitude) across the globe. All explanatory variables were standardized (z-transformed) in the SEM analyses. The nine plant traits used in these analyses were selected from a potential pool of 15 potential traits using the significance of percentage increase in mean square error using Random Forest analyses (Fig. S3 in Supplementary Information). With these analyses we aimed to determine which traits are the most influential in describing the relative difference between islands and their interspaces (as measured with the RII) for each of the three synthetic functions (Decomposition, Fertility, Conservation). Random Forest is a robust approach when working with continuous and categorical variables. The 15 traits considered, which relate to plant size and structure, leaf characteristics, and ability to respond to environmental stimuli

(palatability, resprouting, deciduousness, allelopathy) potentially influence: 1) how nutrients are mineralized and made available to plants (Decomposition), 2) contribute to soil nutrient (including carbon) pools (Fertility) and 3) how soil and water are conserved (Conservation). Random forest analyses were conducted with the rfPermute package⁶⁶.

Structural equation modelling allowed us to test hypothesized relationships among predictors and the fertile island effect based on an *a priori* model that constructs pathways among model terms based on *a priori* knowledge (Fig. S5 in Supplementary Information). This model predicted that spatial location would affect all the predictors such as climate, plant attributes (including site-level vegetation attributes and plant traits), soil attributes and grazing. Climate would influence the fertile island effect through its influence on soil properties, grazing, and plant attributes. Grazing and soil properties would affect the fertile island effect directly, or indirectly, by altering plant attributes. We ran the SEM on the RII of the three functional categories (Decomposition, Fertility, Conservation, Fig. S4 in Supplementary Information). To obtain the values for these three average functions, we employed the concept of the multifunctionality index and averaged the values of the RII for all individual attributes that comprised each function. Models with low χ^2 and Root Mean Error of Approximation (RMSEA < 0.05), and high Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and R^2 were selected as the best fit model for our data. In addition, we calculated the standardised total effects of each explanatory variable to show its total effect. SEM analyses were performed using SPSS AMOS 22 (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA) software.

Data Availability

The data used for this study is available via the Figshare repository <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.25283074.v1>.

Other databases used in this study is listed as below: Global Aridity Index and Potential Evapotranspiration Climate Database v2 aridity database (<https://cgiarcsi.community/2019/01/24/global-aridity-index-and-potential-evapotranspiration-climate-database-v2/>); WorldClim Version 2.0 (<http://www.worldclim.org/>); Woody Plants Database (<http://woodyplants.cals.cornell.edu/>); TRY Database (<https://www.try-db.org/TryWeb/Home.php>); PLANTS Database (<https://plants.usda.gov/>); BROT Database (<https://www.uv.es/jgpausas/brot.htm>)

Acknowledgments

Funding: This research was supported by the European Research Council [ERC grant 647038 (BIODESERT) awarded to F.T.M.] and Generalitat Valenciana (CIDEAGENT/2018/041). D.E. was supported by the Hermon Slade Foundation (HSF21040). J.DING was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Project (41991232) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central

Universities of China. M.D-B. acknowledges support from TED2021-130908B-C41/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/Unión Europea Next Generation EU/PRTR and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation for the I + D + i project PID2020-115813RA-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. O.S. was supported by US National Science Foundation (Grants DEB 1754106, 20-25166), and Y.L.B.-P. by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Individual Fellowship (MSCA-1018 IF) within the European Program Horizon 2020 (DRYFUN Project 656035). K.G. and N.B. acknowledge support from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) SPACES projects OPTIMASS (FKZ: 01LL1302A) and ORYCS (FKZ: FKZ01LL1804A). B.B. was supported by the Taylor Family-Asia Foundation Endowed Chair in Ecology and Conservation Biology, and M.A.B. by funding from the School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University. C.B. acknowledges funding from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (41971131). D.B. acknowledges support from the Hungarian Research, Development and Innovation Office (NKFI KKP 144096) and A.F. support from ANID PIA/BASAL FB 210006 and the Millennium Science Initiative Program NCN2021-050. M.F. and H.E. received funding from Ferdowsi University of Mashhad (Grant 39843). A.N. and M.K. acknowledge support from FCT (CEECIND/02453/2018/CP1534/CT0001, SFRH/BD/130274/2017, PTDC/ASP-SIL/7743/2020, UIDB/00329/2020), EEA (10/CALL#5), AdaptForGrazing (PRR-C05-i03-I-000035) and LTsER Montado platform (LTER_EU_PT_001) grants. O.V. acknowledges support from the Hungarian Research, Development and Innovation Office (NKFI KKP 144096). L.W. was supported by the US National Science Foundation (EAR 1554894). Z.Z. and X.Z. were supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (U2003214). H.S. is supported by a María Zambrano fellowship funded by the Ministry of Universities and European Union-Next Generation plan. The use of any trade, firm, or product names does not imply endorsement by any agency, institution or government. Finally, we thank the many people who assisted with field work, and the landowners, corporations and national bodies that allowed us access to their land.

Author Contributions Statement

F.T.M. designed and coordinated the field survey. D.J.E. and J.DING conceived the study. J.D. undertook the Bayesian analyses, M.M-C. drafted the figures, and J.DING produced the map. Laboratory analyses were performed by V.O., B.G., B.J.M., S.A., A.R., P.D.M., C.P., N.E., M.R., S.C. and M.D-B. The remaining authors collected and managed field data collection. D.J.E. and J.DING wrote the draft manuscript in collaboration with F.T.M. and O.S., and with contributions from all authors.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Average function (mean relative interaction effect value across 24 soil attributes, see Methods) for the 288 plots at 88 sites across global drylands and examples of fertile islands at selected sites. The background map shows the distribution of aridity ($1 - [\text{precipitation}/\text{potential evapotranspiration}]$) across global drylands.

Figure 2. The fertile island effect, as measured with the relative interaction effect (RII), beneath perennial dryland plants for the 24 soil attributes measured across three functions. $N=288$ for all the attributes, data are presented as mean $\pm$ 95% CI and darker colours indicate significant positive effects.

Figure 3. Impacts of recent grazing and climate on the fertile island effect. (a) Relative interaction effect (RII) value surfaces for the three measures of ecosystem function (Decomposition, Fertility, Conservation) in relation to recent grazing pressure (standardized dung mass) and aridity, and mean ($\pm$ 95% CI) predicted RII value for the three functions in relation to (b) long-term (historic) measure of herbivore grazing pressure (ungrazed, low, medium, high), and (c) herbivore type (livestock, native, mixed). Numbers in (b-c) are replicates for each category.

Figure 4. Structural equation modelling assessing the direct and indirect effects of climate (aridity [ARID], rainfall seasonality [SEAS]), soil (pH and sand [SAND] content), plants (perennial cover [COV], perennial plant richness [RICH]), plant height [HT], plant shape [SHAPE], leaf area [AREA], leaf length [LNGTH], canopy width [WIDTH], palatability [PALAT], deciduousness [DECID], resprouting ability [RESP], and allelopathy [ALLEL]), and grazing (standardized grazing pressure) on the fertile island effect for soil decomposition (Decomposition), soil fertility (Fertility) and soil and water conservation (Conservation), after accounting for the effects of location (latitude, cosine longitude, sine longitude). Standardised path coefficients, adjacent to the arrows, are analogous to partial correlation coefficients, and indicative of the effect size of the relationship. Pathways are significantly negative (red unbroken line), significant positive (blue unbroken line) or mixed significant negative and significant positive (black unbroken lines). Non-significant pathways are not shown in the models. Model fit: (a) organic matter decomposition: $\chi^2 = 31.9$, $df = 26$, $P = 0.20$, $R^2=0.17$, root mean error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.001 , Bollen-Stine = 0.40 (2000 bootstrap); (b) Fertility: $\chi^2 = 31.9$, $df = 26$, $P = 0.20$, $R^2=0.19$, root mean error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.001 , Bollen-Stine = 0.40 (2000 bootstrap); (c) Conservation: $\chi^2 = 31.9$, $df = 26$, $P = 0.20$, $R^2=0.10$, root mean error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.001 , Bollen-Stine = 0.40 (2000 bootstraps). $N=288$ for all analyses.


References

1. Thiery, J.M., d'Herbes, J.M. & Valentin, C. A model simulating the genesis of banded vegetation patterns in Niger. *J. Ecol.* **459**, 497-507 (1995).
2. Aguiar, M.R. & Sala, O.E. Patch structure, dynamics and implications for the functioning of arid ecosystems. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **14**, 273-277 (1999).
3. Tongway, D.J. & Ludwig, J.A. Small-scale resource heterogeneity in semi-arid landscapes. *Pacif. Conserv. Biol.* **1**, 201 (1994).
4. Ochoa-Hueso, R. *et al.* Soil fungal abundance and plant functional traits drive fertile island formation in global drylands. *J. Ecol.* **106**, 242-253 (2018).
5. Alary, V., Lasseur, J., Frija, A. & Gautier, D. Assessing the sustainability of livestock socio-ecosystems in the drylands through a set of indicators. *Agric. Sys.* **198**, 103389 (2022)
6. Eldridge, D.J., Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Travers, S.K., Val, J. & Oliver, I. Do grazing intensity and herbivore type affect soil health? Insights from a semi-arid productivity gradient. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **54**, 976-985 (2017).
7. Middleton, N. Rangeland management and climate hazards in drylands: dust storms, desertification and the overgrazing debate. *Nat. Hazards* **92**, 57-70 (2018).
8. Ding, J. & Eldridge, D.J. The fertile island effect varies with aridity and plant patch type across an extensive continental gradient. *Plant Soil* **459**, 1-11 (2020).
9. Cai, Y. *et al.* The fertile island effect collapses under extreme overgrazing: evidence from a shrub-encroached grassland. *Plant Soil* **448**, 201-212 (2020).
10. Pei, S., Fu, H., Wan, C., Chen, Y. & Sosebee, R.E. Observations on changes in soil properties in grazed and nongrazed areas of Alxa Desert Steppe, Inner Mongolia. *Arid Land Res. Manage.* **20**, 161-175 (2006).
11. Allington, G.R. & Valone, T. Islands of fertility: a byproduct of grazing? *Ecosyst.* **17**, 127-141 (2014).
12. Maestre, F.T. *et al.* Grazing and ecosystem service delivery in global drylands. *Science*, **378**, 915-920 (2022).
13. Schade, J.D. & Hobbie, S.E. Spatial and temporal variation in islands of fertility in the Sonoran Desert. *Biogeochem.* **73**, 541-553 (2005).
14. Ridolfi, L., Laio, F. & D'Odorico, P. Fertility island formation and evolution in dryland ecosystems. *Ecol. Society*, **13**, 5 (2008)
15. Maestre, F.T. *et al.* Structure and functioning of dryland ecosystems in a changing world. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. System.* **47**, 215-237 (2016).
16. Charley, J.L. & West, N.E. Plant-induced soil chemical patterns in some shrub-dominated semi-desert ecosystems of Utah. *J. Ecol.* **63**, 945-963 (1975).
17. DeLuca, T.H. & Zackrisson, O. Enhanced soil fertility under *Juniperus communis* in arctic ecosystems. *Plant Soil* **294**, 147-155 (2007).
18. Whitford, W.G., Anderson, J. & Rice, P.M. Stemflow contribution to the 'fertile island' effect in creosotebush, *Larrea tridentata*. *J. Arid Envir.* **35**, 451-457 (1997).

- 825 19. Dunkerley, D. Systematic variation of soil infiltration rates within and between
826 the components of the vegetation mosaic in an Australian desert landscape.
827 *Hydrol. Process.* **16**, 119-131 (2002).
- 828 20. Ward, D. *et al.* Large shrubs increase soil nutrients in a semi-arid savanna.
829 *Geoderma* **310**, 153-162 (2018).
- 830 21. Hollister, G.B., Engledow, A.S., Hammett, A.J.M., Provin, T.L., Wilkinson,
831 H.H. & Gentry, T.J. Shifts in microbial community structure along an
832 ecological gradient of hypersaline soils and sediments. *ISME J.* **4**, 829-838
833 (2010).
- 834 22. Van Der Heijden, M.G., Bardgett, R.D. & Van Straalen, N.V. The unseen
835 majority: soil microbes as drivers of plant diversity and productivity in
836 terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* **11**, 296-310 (2008).
- 837 23. Berg, G. Plant-microbe interactions promoting plant growth and health:
838 perspectives for controlled use of microorganisms in agriculture. *Appl.*
839 *Microbiol. Biotech.* **84**, 11-18 (2009).
- 840 24. Dohn, J., Dembélé, F., Karembé, M., Moustakas, A., Amévor, K.A. & Hanan,
841 N.P. Tree effects on grass growth in savannas: competition, facilitation and the
842 stress-gradient hypothesis. *J. Ecol.* **101**, 202-209 (2013).
- 843 25. Lai, L. & Kumar, S. A global meta-analysis of livestock grazing impacts on soil
844 properties. *PLoS One* **15**, e0236638 (2020).
- 845 26. Schlesinger, W.H. *et al.* Biological feedbacks in global desertification. *Science*
846 **247**, 1043-1048 (1990).
- 847 27. Reynolds, J.F., Virginia, R.A., Kemp, P.R., De Soyza, A.G. & Tremmel, D.C.
848 Impact of drought on desert shrubs: effects of seasonality and degree of
849 resource island development. *Ecol. Monog.* **69**, 69-106 (1999).
- 850 28. Funk, J.L. *et al.* Revisiting the Holy Grail: using plant functional traits to
851 understand ecological processes. *Biol. Rev.* **92**, 1156-1173 (2017).
- 852 29. Grace, J.B. *Structural equation modeling and natural systems*. Cambridge
853 University Press (2006).
- 854 30. Chen, S., Cao, R., Yoshitake, S. & Ohtsuka, T. Stemflow hydrology and DOM
855 flux in relation to tree size and rainfall event characteristics. *Agric. Forest*
856 *Meteorol.* **279**, 107753 (2019).
- 857 31. Fischer, M. *et al.* Plant species richness and functional traits affect community
858 stability after a flood event. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150276 (2016).
- 859 32. Verheyen, K., Bulteel, H., Palmborg, C., Olivié, B., Nijs, I., Raes, D. & Muys,
860 B. Can complementarity in water use help to explain diversity-productivity
861 relationships in experimental grassland plots? *Oecologia* **156**, 351-361 (2008).
- 862 33. Hook, P.B., Burke, I.C. & Lauenroth, W.K. Heterogeneity of soil and plant N
863 and C associated with individual plants and openings in North American
864 shortgrass steppe. *Plant Soil* **138**, 247-256 (1991).
- 865 34. Ludwig, J.A., Wilcox, B.P., Breshears, D.D., Tongway, D.J. & Imeson, A.C.
866 Vegetation patches and runoff-erosion as interacting ecohydrological processes
867 in semiarid landscapes. *Ecol.* **86**, 288-297 (2005).

35. Eldridge, D.J., Beecham, G. & Grace, J.B. Do shrubs reduce the adverse effects of grazing on soil properties? *Ecohydrol.* **8**, 1503-1513 (2015).
36. Travers, S.K. & Berdugo, M. Grazing and productivity alter individual grass size dynamics in semi-arid woodlands. *Ecography* **43**, 1003-1013 (2020).
37. Piluzza, G., Sulas, L. & Bullitta, S. Tannins in forage plants and their role in animal husbandry and environmental sustainability: a review. *Grass Forage Sci.* **69**, 32-48 (2014).
38. De Soyza, A.G., Franco, A.C., Virginia, R.A., Reynolds, J.F. & Whitford, W.G. Effects of plant size on photosynthesis and water relations in the desert shrub *Prosopis glandulosa* (Fabaceae). *Amer. J. Bot.* **83**, 99-105 (1996).
39. Dean, W.R.G., Milton, S.J. & Jeltsch, F. Large trees, fertile islands, and birds in arid savanna. *J. Arid Envir.* **41**, 61-78 (1999).
40. Gibb, H. Effects of planting method on the recovery of arboreal ant activity on revegetated farmland. *Aust. Ecol.* **37**, 789-799 (2012).
41. Bolling, J.D. & Walker, L.R. Fertile island development around perennial shrubs across a Mojave Desert chronosequence. *W. Nth. Amer. Nat.* **62**, 88-100 (2002).
42. Tiedemann, A.R. & Klemmedson, J.O. Long-term effects of mesquite removal on soil characteristics: I: Nutrients and bulk density. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. J.* **50**, 472-475 (1986).
43. Belsky, A.J., Mwonga, S.M. & Duxbury, J.M. Effects of widely spaced trees and livestock grazing on understory environments in tropical savannas. *Agroforest Syst.* **24**, 1-20 (1993).
44. Maestre, F.T. *et al.* The BIODESERT survey: Assessing the impacts of grazing on the structure and functioning of global drylands. *Web Ecol.* **22**, 75-96 (2022).
45. Turner, M.D. Long-term effects of daily grazing orbits on nutrient availability in Sahelian West Africa: I: Gradients in the chemical composition of rangeland soils and vegetation. *J. Biogeog.* **25**, 669-682 (1998).
46. Rasmussen, H. B., Kahindi, O., Vollrath, F. & Douglas-Hamilton, I. Estimating elephant densities from wells and droppings in dried out riverbeds. *Afr. J. Ecol.* **43**, 312-319 (2005).
47. Guerra Alonso, C., Zurita, G. & Bellocq, M. Response of dung beetle taxonomic and functional diversity to livestock grazing in an arid ecosystem. *Ecol. Entom.* **46**, 582-591 (2020).
48. Dickinson, C.H., Underhay, V.S.H. & Ross, V. Effect of season, soil fauna and water content on the decomposition of cattle dung pats. *New Phytol.* **88**, 129-141 (1981).
49. Eldridge, D.J., Poore, A.G.B., Ruiz-Colmenero, M., Letnic, M. & Soliveres, S. Ecosystem structure, function and composition in rangelands are negatively affected by livestock grazing. *Ecol. Applic.* **36**, 1273-1283 (2016).
50. Travers, S.K., Eldridge, D.J., Koen, T.B., Val, J. & Oliver, I. Livestock and kangaroo grazing have little effect on biomass and fuel hazard in semi-arid woodlands. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **467**, 118165 (2020)

- 911 51. Goutte, C., Toft, P., Rostrup, E., Nielsen, F.A. & Hansen, L.K. On clustering
912 fMRI time series. *Neuroimage* **9**, 298-310 (1999).
- 913 52. Lange, R.T. The Piosphere: sheep track and dung patterns. *J. Range Manage.*
914 **22**, 396-400 (1969).
- 915 53. Pringle, H.J.R. & Landsberg, J. Predicting the distribution of livestock grazing
916 pressure in rangelands. *Aust. Ecol.* **29**, 31-39 (2004).
- 917 54. Tavşanoğlu, Ç. & Pausas, J. A functional trait database for Mediterranean Basin
918 plants. *Sci Data* **5**, 180135 (2018).
- 919 55. USDA. The PLANTS Database. National Plant Data Team (2019).
- 920 56. Kattge, J. *et al.* TRY—a global database of plant traits. *Glob. Change Biol.* **17**,
921 2905-2935 (2011).
- 922 57. Kettler, T.A., Doran, J.W. & Gilbert, T.L. Simplified method for soil particle-
923 size determination to accompany soil-quality analyses. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* **65**,
924 849-852 (2001).
- 925 58. Armas, C., Ordiales, R., & Pugnaire, F.I. Measuring plant interactions: a new
926 comparative index. *Ecology* **85**, 2682-2686 (2004).
- 927 59. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (2018)
- 928 60. Fick, S.E. & Hijmans, R.J. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate
929 surfaces for global land areas. *Intern. J. Climatol.* **37**, 4302-4315 (2017).
- 930 61. Zomer, R.J., Xu, J. & Trabucco, A. Version 3 of the Global Aridity Index and
931 Potential Evapotranspiration Database. *Sci Data* **9**, 409 (2022).
- 932 62. Zhang, Y-w., Wang, K-b., Wang, J., Liu, C. & Shangguan, Z. P. Changes in soil
933 water holding capacity and water availability following vegetation restoration
934 on the Chinese Loess Plateau. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 9692 (2021).
- 935 63. Carpenter, B. *et al.* Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *J. Stat. Softw.*
936 **76**, 1-32 (2017).
- 937 64. Goodrich, B., Gabry, J., Ali, I. & Brilleman, S. rstanarm: Bayesian applied
938 regression modeling via Stan. R package version 2.21.1 [https://mc-](https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm)
939 [stan.org/rstanarm](https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm). (2020).
- 940 65. McElreath, R. *Statistical rethinking* (2nd ed.), CRC Press (2020).
- 941 66. Archer E. rfPermute: Estimate Permutation p-Values for Random Forest
942 Importance Metrics. R package version 1. 5. 2 (2016).



- Hyperarid
- Arid
- Semiarid
- Dry subhumid
- Non-dryland



