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Abstract


In many areas of the world undesirable dispersal of organic pesticides into untargeted environments has occurred, and is continuing, raising serious concerns about their potential impact on the environment and human health. The main agents ultimately responsible for the degradation of these substances are microorganisms, so it is important to understand their effects on microbial metabolism and the complex interactive effects of soil parameters, microbial activities, pesticide availability and pesticide degradation dynamics. The studies presented in this thesis elucidate some such interactions involving three pesticides: 2,6-dichlorobenzamide, 2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile and 2,4-dichlorophenol. The respiration kinetics of soil microorganisms in the presence and absence of pesticides were measured and used to derive information on catabolic and anabolic components of the microbial responses. Furthermore, the effects of charge density and pH of surfaces of soil particles were also investigated by manipulating soil solution pH, the pH of organic matter surfaces and the mineral composition (and hence surface charge density) of test soils. The pH and charge density of particle surfaces were found to strongly influence soil microbial processes and the fate and behaviour of pesticides in soils. In addition, the effects of sorption on the availability and degradability of glyphosate, one of the most commonly used pesticides in the world, were examined using respiration measurements in combination with attenuated total reflectance-Fourier transform infra-red spectroscopy analysis. Raising the pH of an acidic soil with high organic matter content was found to reduce the toxic effects of 2,4-dichlorophenol on anabolic microbial processes, but the effects of its toxicity towards catabolic processes were less pronounced. 2,6-dichlorobenzamide had greater negative effects on microbial metabolic processes at neutral than at acid pH. Increasing the surface charge density and raising the surface pH of the soil organic matter reduced the negative effects of 2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile on microorganisms. Soil surface charge density and pH therefore interactively influence the effects of the pesticides on microbial metabolism. Further experiments showed that sorbed glyphosate can be used by the microorganisms as a source of C, N and possibly P.
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Abbreviations

AMPA    Aminomethylphosphonic acid
ATR-FTIR Attenuated total reflectance-Fourier transform infra-red spectroscopy
BAM 2,6-Dichlorobenzamide
BR Basal respiration rate
BR$_{\text{diff}}$ Difference in basal respiration before and after pesticide addition
DCP Dichlorophenol
K$_{\text{OW}}$ Octanol water partitioning coefficient
MLR Multiple linear regression
OM Organic matter
PCA Principal component analysis
PCR Principal component regression
PLS Partial least squares projection to latent structures
PZC Point of zero charge
R$_{\text{max}}$ Maximum respiration rate
SCD Surface charge density
SIR Substrate-induced respiration
SOM Soil organic matter
$\tau_{\text{max}}$ Time to reach maximum respiration rate
$\mu$ Natural logarithm of exponential growth
Introduction

The focus of this thesis is on the importance of soil properties for the activities of soil microorganisms, especially their responses to pesticides. The thesis addresses the effects of interactions between soil particle surfaces, pH and pesticides on the metabolism of soil microorganisms. More specifically, the main issues addressed were the effects of variations in surface charge density (SCD) and pH in both soil solution and at the surface of the soil organic matter (SOM) in the presence and absence of organic pesticides on catabolic and anabolic processes of microbial metabolism. The effects of surface sorption on the degradability and bioavailability of an organic pesticide in soil were also addressed. In order to assess the effect of the soil properties and pesticides on the microorganisms, respiration kinetic measurements that distinguished between catabolic and anabolic components of microbial metabolic responses were used.

Pesticides – for better and worse

In daily life people are exposed to a variety of harmful synthetic compounds that have been released into the environment through both commercial and domestic activities. These compounds include pesticides used for a variety of purposes, *inter alia*; to increase the durability of wooden products, to control weeds in gardens or fields, and to protect crops. The extensive use of pesticides, which must be toxic (at least to the targeted pests) to be effective, has led to the unwanted dispersal of pesticides into untargeted environments (Clausen et al., 2002, Droz et al., 2005). The ideal pesticide acts on the target organism, degrades into harmless metabolites and disappears before it has had time to migrate into and adversely affect non-targeted environmental compartments. However, pesticides are designed to persist long enough to have the desired effects on the target organisms. Moreover, pesticide metabolites also vary in terms of persistency and toxicity (e.g. Greer et al., 1990). Furthermore, their metabolites often have very different physicochemical characteristics in terms of their sorption and water solubility parameters (e.g. Barja & Alfonso, 2005, Clausen et al., 2004). These features highlight the importance of understanding pesticide degradation processes and the effects of the pesticides on microbial metabolism.

In order to develop efficacious pesticides and application techniques that minimize dispersal of xenobiotic chemicals into untargeted environments, and remediation strategies, it is important to understand the effects of both the pure compounds and their degradation products on microbial activity in soils. Microbial degradation and transformation of pesticides occurs through oxidation, reduction, hydrolytic and synthetic reactions and, in common with the decomposition of naturally occurring recalcitrant compounds, there are facilitative interactions within the microbial community (Bollag & Liu, 1990). Numerous microbial species are known to have the capacity to degrade complex organic structures. Important groups of soil organisms in this respect include actinomycetes (Paul & Clark, 1996) and many fungi of various classes: ascomycota, basidiomycota,
deutoeromycota and zygomycota (Cerniglia et al., 1992). For successful degradation of any compound the microorganisms must be able to produce appropriate enzymes and the compound must not be too toxic to them. The compound also needs to be bioavailable, i.e. accessible to the microorganisms and not irreversibly sorbed to soil particles. The sorption parameters of the compounds are governed by their hydrophobicity and the physicochemical conditions of the soil.

**Parameters of the soil environment**

*Interactions with microorganisms*

Two physicochemical variables of the soil environment that strongly influence microbial processes are the soil particle surface charge density (SCD) and the pH. Both SCD and pH are highly influenced by the composition of soil particles (i.e. mineral and organic components) and their particle size distribution (Sposito, 1989; Smith et al., 1993).

The soil surface charge is of great significance for microbial adhesion (Mills, 2003). In addition, growth on a surface is highly advantageous for microorganisms since surfaces can attract nutrients and organic compounds (Stark et al., 1938). Other processes that are also affected by the sorption properties of soil surfaces include (*inter alia*) exoenzyme activities (Ahn et al., 2002, George et al., 2005) and the physical availability of water, i.e. the thickness of the water films on them, and how strongly the films are bound.

The pH and charge at the surface of a soil particle are intimately related to the pH and ionic strength of the bulk solution (Bolan et al. 1999). The abundance of protons in the diffusive double layer generates the pH at the soil particle surface. The diffusive double layer is formed by the force of attraction of the negatively charged particle surfaces in the soil on the cations in the soil solution. The point of zero charge (PZC) of microorganisms and most soil particle surfaces is lower than the soil solution pH, which is usually 5-8 (Mills, 2003). Thus, microorganisms and soil surfaces are generally negatively charged and do not attract each other. Their negative surface charge is, however, counterbalanced by the cations in the soil solution (Mills, 2003). The pH also has a direct influence on microorganisms, mainly mediated by its effects on enzyme activities (Niemi & Vepsalainen, 2005), and thus their metabolism.

*Interactions with pesticides*

Organic pesticides are a versatile group of compounds that can be aromatic or aliphatic, have various functional groups and be ionic, polar or nonpolar. Like any other compound the sorption interaction with soil particles depends on the chemical properties of the organic pesticide and the properties of the soil. The strength of these interactions can vary from the relatively weak bonds of van der Waals forces (which do, however, increase in strength with increases in contact area) to the stronger bonds of covalent character (Koskinen & Harper, 1990).
Another type of sorption interaction is the hydrophobic partitioning of nonpolar, hydrophobic compounds to organic matter (McBride, 1994). A compound in the soil may thus be influenced by several different sorption interactions with soil particles, and the potential number of sorption processes that affect it increases with increases in the compound’s polarity, number of functional groups and ionisation (Koskinen & Harper, 1990). The pH controls the speciation of the compound, which can be determined from its pK_a. The species that dominates at a certain pH thereby also determines the nature of soil sorption interactions. However, since pH not only affects the speciation of the compound, but also the soil environment as a whole, effects of pH can be difficult to interpret.

**Investigated pesticides**

*Solubility and sorption properties*

The model pesticides used in the experiments (Papers I-III, table 1) range from highly hydrophobic to highly hydrophilic organic compounds. The pesticide 2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile (dichlobenil) (table 1) is a nonpolar compound that has very low solubility in water and is insensitive to low pH (EPA, 1998). The proportions of dichlobenil that sorb to sediments have been found to correlate with the organic matter contents of the sediments (Jernlås, 1990, Clausen et al., 2004), but Sheng et al. (2001) have shown that K^+-saturated smectite can sorb dichlobenil to an even higher extent than soil organic matter. The main metabolite of dichlobenil is 2,6-dichlorobenzamide (BAM) (table 1), (Beynon & Wright, 1972), which readily dissolves in water. BAM sorbs to sediments to a lesser extent than dichlobenil, however the sorption of BAM is also correlated to the organic content of the soil (Clausen et al., 2004). Sorption of the chlorophenol 2,4-DCP is strongly positively correlated with soil organic contents, and in highly alkaline environments the high cation concentrations also promote adsorption of ionized chlorophenols (Schellenberg et al., 1984). The pesticide N-phosphonomethylglycine (glyphosate) (table 1) is a polar compound and is readily dissociated in water. In soil, glyphosate is rapidly adsorbed and its adsorption is positively related to the presence of aluminium and iron oxides (Gerritse et al., 1996; Morillo et al., 2000; Gimsing and Børggaard, 2002).
Table 1. Physico-chemical properties of the pesticides dichlobenil, 2,4-D and glyphosate and their degradation products BAM, 2,4-DCP and AMPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dichlobenil</th>
<th>BAM</th>
<th>2,4-D</th>
<th>2,4-DCP</th>
<th>Glyphosate</th>
<th>AMPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural formula</td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
<td><img src="structure.png" alt="Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical name</td>
<td>2,6-dichlorobenzonitrile</td>
<td>2,6-dichlorobenzamide</td>
<td>2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid</td>
<td>2,4-dichlorophenol</td>
<td>N-phosphonomethylglycine</td>
<td>Aminomethylphosphonic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight (g mol⁻¹)</td>
<td>172.01</td>
<td>190.03</td>
<td>221.04</td>
<td>163.01</td>
<td>169.07</td>
<td>110.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapor pressure (mPa)</td>
<td>88 (20 °C)ᵃ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02 (25 °C)ᵃ</td>
<td>16 * 10⁰ (20 °C)ᵇ</td>
<td>negligibleᶜ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solubility (mg L⁻¹)</td>
<td>18 (20 °C)ᵃ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20031 (pH 5, 25 °C)ᵃ</td>
<td>4600 (20 °C)ᵈ</td>
<td>12 * 10³ᵉ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log K⁰₏</td>
<td>2.70ᵃ</td>
<td>0.77ᶠ</td>
<td>0.04-0.33 (pH 5)ᵃ</td>
<td>3.17ᵉ</td>
<td>0.94ʰ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH⁰</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.73ᵃ</td>
<td>7.85ⁱ</td>
<td>&lt; 2, 2.6, 5.6, 10.6ⁱ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD₅₀ (rat) (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>4460ᵏ</td>
<td>1144-2330ⁱ</td>
<td>639-764ᵃ</td>
<td>47ᵐ</td>
<td>4300ᵏ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC₅₀ (fish) (mg L⁻¹)</td>
<td>22 (48 h)ᵈ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27-300 (96 h)ᵈ</td>
<td>5.5-8.2 (96 h)ᵈ</td>
<td>120-170 (48 h)ᶜ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LD₅₀: Oral dose resulting in 50% lethality
LC₅₀: Concentration resulting in 50% lethality
- Data not found

Environmental fate and distribution

Glyphosate and 2,4-DCP are pesticides that have been quite thoroughly studied (e.g. Haney et al., 2000, Jensen, 1996), but fewer studies have addressed the detrimental effects of dichlobenil and BAM on microorganisms in soils and water (exceptions include those published by Nikolova & Bakalivanov, 1972, Vosáhlová et al., 1997, Heinonen-Tanski, 1981). Dichlobenil is used both as an aquatic and a terrestrial broadleaf pesticide, and although it has been banned in Sweden since 1990, globally it is one of the most widely used pesticides. The major environmental concern related to dichlobenil and BAM is their dispersal to drinking water and BAM has been found in many water supply wells globally (e.g. Clausen et al., 2002, Droz et al., 2005). The dispersal of dichlobenil in soils and surface waters occurs mainly through volatilization (EPA, 1998). Though BAM has often been shown to be resistant to further degradation both in soil and culture studies (Verloop & Nimmo, 1970, Miyazaki et al., 1975, Holtze et al., 2006), a recent study by Simonsen et al. (2006) detected rapid mineralization of BAM in a soil precontaminated with dichlobenil.

The chlorophenol 2,4-DCP can be generated as an impurity in the production of the pesticide 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) (Jensen, 1996) (table 1) and is also formed as a metabolite of the pesticide (Greer et al., 1990). 2,4-DCP is a lipophilic compound that hampers catabolism by acting as an uncoupler inhibiting the oxidative phosphorylation of ATP (Terada 1990, Escher et al., 1996). The persistency of chlorophenols in soils is highly influenced by their concentration, the organic matter content of the soil, temperature and the presence of microorganisms that are able to degrade them (e.g., Edgehill, 1999, Steinle et al., 2000, Bengtsson & Carlsson, 2001, Sponza & Uluköy, 2005).

Glyphosate is a broad-spectrum pesticide and is claimed to be the most commonly used pesticide around the world in forestry and agriculture. Recent studies have shown that glyphosate can stimulate microbial activity (Haney et al., 2000, 2002, Busse et al., 2001, Araújo et al., 2003) and few studies have found any evidence that it has harmful effects on soil microorganisms (Busse et al., 2001). Glyphosate is also minimally dispersed in soil since both glyphosate and its primary metabolite in soil, aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA) (Rueppel et al. 1977) (table 1), strongly absorb to soil particles (Sprankle et al., 1975ab). AMPA is less susceptible to microbial degradation than glyphosate since it tends to sorb more strongly to soil surfaces (Torstensson, 1985).

Techniques

Various techniques can be used to study microbial metabolism under different environmental conditions. General techniques for measuring microbial activity in natural samples include (inter alia) measurements of respiration, ATP contents and the incorporation of tritiated [3H]lysine or [3H]thymidine into protein and DNA, respectively. In combination with various experimental setups such techniques can provide valuable information on specific growth characteristics. A common method for studies of microbial degradation is 14C-labelling of the
compound considered. The respired $^{14}$CO$_2$ can then be used as a measure of the microbial degradation of the compound. In order to identify various organic compounds GC-MS and IR spectroscopy techniques are commonly used. An advantage with GC-MS is that the compounds can be quantified, while using IR only relative comparisons between treatments are possible. However, with IR techniques information on the interactions between the studied compound(s) and the soil surfaces can be obtained. Thus, combined analyses of microbial respiration kinetics and molecular level soil chemistry can be used to elucidate biogeochemical processes more comprehensively than either type of analysis alone.

**Objectives**

The overall aim of the studies underlying this thesis was to evaluate the effects of different soil properties and organic pesticides on microbial metabolism. Specific objectives were as follows:

- To determine the effects of interactions between pH and the pesticides BAM, dichlobenil and 2,4-DCP on microbial catabolic and anabolic processes in soils (Paper I)
- To determine the effect of soil surface pH, soil surface charge density, dichlobenil and 2,4-DCP on metabolic parameters of microbial populations (Paper II)
- To determine the effect of glyphosate sorption to goethite on microbial utilization of glyphosate-P, -N, -C (Paper III)

**Material and Methods**

**Soil sampling and soil preparation**

Inoculates in all experiments originated from samples of the organic layer collected from Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) stands in either the Nyånget catchment area (64°15’N, 19°45’E, altitude 225 m a.s.l.) in Svarberget Experimental Forest, Vindeln, northern Sweden (Papers I and III) or from a site 6 km south-east of Umeå, Sweden (altitude 25 m a.s.l.) (Paper II). Within 12 hours of sampling the soil was passed through a sieve with a 5 mm mesh to remove coarse roots and plant residues, gently homogenized and then stored in polyethylene bags at -20°C awaiting further use (Papers I-III). The pH of the organic matter-rich soil, determined either by water extraction (0.5 h, soil:solution ratio 1:4) (Paper III) or in a soil slurry (12 h, aqueous soil solution ratio 1:3) (Papers I and II), varied between 3.6–4.1, and loss on ignition (LOI) varied between 88–94% (5h, 550°C) (Papers I-III).
components and in a mixture of SOM (S), goethite (G), and montmorillonite (M), as well as pH calculated at surfaces of SOM (S) and goethite (G).

Table 2. Soil surface charge densities of soil components and in a mixture of SOM (S), goethite (G) and montmorillonite (M), as well as pH calculated at surfaces of SOM (S) and goethite (G).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>SOM(^1)</th>
<th>Goethite(^2)</th>
<th>Mixture(^3)</th>
<th>pH(_{G})^4</th>
<th>pH(_{G})^5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>pH 3.6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+M50</td>
<td>pH 3.9</td>
<td>-250</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+M100</td>
<td>pH 4.0</td>
<td>-250</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+G50</td>
<td>pH 5.2</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+G100</td>
<td>pH 5.5</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>pH 7.0</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+M50</td>
<td>pH 7.0</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+M100</td>
<td>pH 7.0</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+G50</td>
<td>pH 8.2</td>
<td>-1100</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+G100</td>
<td>pH 8.2</td>
<td>-1100</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Data extrapolated from Skyllberg (1996). \(^2\) Theoretically calculated surface charge density of singly coordinated FeOH\(^-\) groups (3.6 site/nm\(^2\)) and pzc of 9.4 using the model CD-MUSIC (Hiemstra & van Riemsdijk, 1996). \(^3\) Cation-exchange capacity, CEC = 300 mmol kg\(^{-1}\). \(^4\) Mass weighted surface charge density for the mixture. \(^5\) pH at the SOM surface (pH\(_{SOM}\)) calculated using the impermeable Sphere model (Avena et al., 1999). \(^6\) pH at the goethite surface (pH\(_{G}\)) calculated as [H\(^+\)] = [H\(^+\)] \(\equiv \) [H\(^+\)] exp (-F\(_{G}\)/RT), \(\Psi = q/C = 0.9\) F m\(^2\). The ionic strength was estimated to be to 0.05 M in all systems, based on conductivity measurements.

No further treatments were applied to the soil used in study III before incubation. However, CaCO\(_3\) or K\(_2\)CO\(_3\) was added to half of the soil samples used in studies I and II, respectively, to increase the pH to ~7 before incubation. The soil sampled for the study in paper II was manipulated to obtain different soil surface pH and surface charge densities by mixing the organic matter-rich soil with goethite or montmorillonite in various proportions (table 2). By passing the blends through a sieve with a 5 mm mesh samples with mineral surface areas of 50 and 100 m\(^2\) per gram of SOM were obtained. Based on measurements obtained using a conductivity meter (Jenway 4010), ionic strength was estimated to be 0.05 M for all of the soil samples. Measurements of the soil solution pH and ionic strength were used to calculate the surface pH and surface charge density (SCD) of the different soil components (table 2). Prior to incubation, the soil moisture content was adjusted to approximately 270-280% of OM to optimize conditions for microbial growth (Ilstedt et al., 2000) (Papers I and III). The soil moisture content of the soil blends in the experiments described in Paper II was adjusted to -15 kPa using suction plates to optimize conditions for microbial growth (Ilstedt et al., 2000).

**Microbial respiration measurements**

**Microbial response variables**

To assess the microbial metabolic responses to the adjustments in the soil variables, with and without pesticides, microbial kinetic parameters were estimated by acquiring and interpreting high-resolution respiration curves. The kinetic parameters (response variables) were then used to describe the effects of
the soil variables and pesticides on anabolic and catabolic components of microbial metabolism. The catabolic processes were represented by the basal respiration rate (BR, mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) and substrate-induced respiration (SIR, mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) (fig. 1). The BR was calculated as the average value of ≥61 hourly measurements, after the respiration rate was considered to have stabilized. SIR is an estimate of the microbial biomass in the soil (Anderson & Domsch, 1978) and was calculated as an average of the stable respiration rate after substrate addition (Nordgren et al., 1988a). The response variables representing the anabolic processes were the slope during the exponential growth phase (μ, h$^{-1}$) (Marstorp & Witter, 1999), the time, after substrate addition, during which the respiration rate remained constant (lag time, h) and the maximum respiration rate (R$_{max}$, mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) (fig. 1). In addition to the parameters described above, we measured the BR before and after addition of pesticides, and the resulting values were used to calculate BR$_{diff}$ (BR$_{after}$ - BR$_{before}$) (Papers I and II), the time to reach the maximum respiration rate after substrate addition (t$_{max}$) (Paper III) (fig. 1) and the cumulative production of CO$_2$ (mg CO$_2$ g$^{-1}$ OM) (Paper I) during the time between the substrate (glucose, nitrogen and phosphorus) addition and the respiration rate peaking in the control samples, i.e. those to which no pesticides had been added. Cumulative CO$_2$ respiration integrates a number of metabolic responses that are only partly correlated with the other variables (the highest correlation was with μ; Pearson correlation r=0.66, p=0.004).

Figure 1. Typical respiration curve from the soil incubations showing descriptors of microbial catabolism (BR and SIR) and of microbial anabolism (μ) and the lag phase. BR is the basal respiration (mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM), and SIR (substrate-induced respiration, mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) was calculated as the average rate of respiration during the period of constant respiration following the addition of glucose. The lag time (h) is the length of the period during which the respiration rate remained constant following the substrate addition and the exponential growth (μ, h$^{-1}$) was estimated from the natural logarithm of the respiration rate (mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) and time (h). R$_{max}$ is the maximum respiration rate (mg CO$_2$ h$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$ OM) and t$_{max}$ (h) is the time taken to reach R$_{max}$. 
Incubation procedures

Briefly, the soil preparations used for the respiration kinetics analyses were first incubated without any additions, then the pesticide was added and the incubation was continued (Papers I-III). Microbial metabolism during these stages of the incubations should theoretically have been largely catabolic. To stimulate microbial growth a carbon source (glucose) and growth rate-limiting nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) were then added (Papers I and II). The pesticides were added either prior to addition of glucose and nitrogen (Papers I, II and III), or at the same time as the glucose, with either nitrogen or phosphorus, and both with and without goethite (Paper III only). The amount of soil used in all of the incubations corresponded to approximately one gram of dry organic matter (OM) (Papers I-III). The pesticide concentrations used in the studies described in Papers I and II were as follows: 100 (Paper I only) and 500 mg g\(^{-1}\) OM dichlobenil; 100 (Paper I only) and 500 mg g\(^{-1}\) OM BAM and 3, 10 (Paper I only) and 30 mg g\(^{-1}\) OM 2,4-DCP. In the studies described in Paper III glyphosate additions were as follows: 4.92 μmol in experiment 1; 0, 10\(^2\), 10\(^3\), 10\(^4\), 10\(^5\) μg in experiment 2; and 8.92 mg g\(^{-1}\) OM in experiment 3. During the incubations respiration kinetics were recorded hourly at 20 °C (±0.1 °C), using an automated respirometer (Respicond III) (Nordgren, 1992 and 1988). Each 250 mL plastic jar held a small container with 0.6 M potassium hydroxide solution, which reacts with respired CO\(_2\). The decrease in conductance occurring when carbonate ions were formed from CO\(_2\) and OH\(^{-}\) ions was monitored through permanently installed platinum electrodes.

Rationale for experimental conditions

For the studies on the interactions between soil properties, pesticides and microbial metabolism in soils, BAM was chosen due to the awareness of its role in contamination following releases of dichlobenil and the limited knowledge of its interactions with microbial metabolism. Dichlobenil is the mother compound of BAM, and has very different properties in terms of hydrophobicity and solubility. In the experiments, due to its low solubility only some of the added dichlobenil was dissolved. The third compound in the study, 2,4-DCP, was chosen for its structural similarities with BAM and dichlobenil, all of which are di-chlorinated compounds. However, all three compounds have different functional groups, which influence their behaviour in the soil environment and their effects on microorganisms. The general toxicity of 2,4-DCP is considered to be high, while BAM and dichlobenil have moderate general toxic effects (table 1). Glyphosate was chosen for the degradation study since it has been thoroughly studied in many respects and is believed to be relatively highly degradable. The main objectives of the studies were to explore some of the mechanisms involved in the interactions between soil properties, the pesticides and microbial activity in soil samples.

One of the main focuses was on the importance of soil particle surfaces for microbial activities, molecular level chemical events, and the interactions between them. The importance of the organic material for soil processes is widely recognized. Therefore we used organic material from the O\(_h\)-horizon of a spodosol as a model system. The organic material was then mixed with mineral fractions
with differing surface charge densities. These model systems, with very high contents of organic material and clay minerals with high surface charge densities, were then used to evaluate the interactions between soil particle surfaces, pesticides and microorganisms. Due to the high content of organic material and high mineral particle surface charge density high concentrations of the substances were required.

**Attenuated total reflectance-Fourier transform infra-red (ATR-FTIR) spectroscopy (Paper III)**

To study the availability of glyphosate sorbed to goethite at a molecular level, ATR-FTIR spectroscopy was used (Paper III). For this purpose, small sub-samples that were visibly rich in goethite were collected from the soil-goethite incubations (experiment 3, Paper III) and were immediately applied to the diamond surface of the ATR cell of the ATR-FTIR system. This consisted of a Bruker IFS 66v/S FTIR spectrometer fitted with a deuterated triglycine sulfate (DTGS) detector, a horizontal ATR accessory and a diamond crystal as the reflection element (SensIR Technologies). The ATR cell was kept under vacuum (3-4 mbar) during acquisition of the spectra.

**Statistical evaluations**

The data presented in both Papers I and III were evaluated separately by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and a post hoc Tukey’s test was used to determine whether there were significant interaction effects (MINITAB 14). Data are presented as mean values with 95% confidence intervals unless otherwise stated. In Paper II, two multivariate statistical techniques were used: principal component analysis (PCA) and partial least squares projection to latent structures (PLS). PCA generates a set of axes, called principal components (PCs), oriented in multidimensional space. The first axis (PC1, the new independent variable) explains most of the variance (Wold et al., 1987). It is determined by calculating the mean, centring the data, then determining the orientation that minimises the residuals between this axis and the data points (Wold et al., 1987). The next component (PC2, calculated in the same way) is orthogonal to the first and accounts for as much of the remaining variance as possible. By projecting the data (observations) at a right angle to the PC, score values \( t_i \) are obtained (Wold et al., 1987). The score values is the distance to the origin and give information about the relationships among the observations. The impact of each variable on the model is described by the loadings \( p_i \), which is the cosine of the angle between the PC and a line connecting the variable to the origin (Wold et al., 1987). A variable with a high loading affects the component to a greater extent than a variable with a low loading. PLS has been developed from PCA and principal component regression (PCR) (Wold et al., 1987). Multiple linear regression (MLR) is used to predict the response \( Y \) of the PCs derived from PCA. PCR provides no information about the relationships between the X and Y matrices, but PLS attempts to maximize the covariance matrices between X and Y.
Results and Discussion

Systematic variation of soil variables affecting microbial catabolic and anabolic responses (Paper II)

Microbial metabolism can be divided into catabolic and anabolic processes. Broadly, the catabolic processes are those required to sustain life, while the main function of the anabolic processes is to build new biomass. Partly due to their contrasting key functions these processes have differing requirements in terms of carbon and nutrient source availability and are limited by the activities of various enzymes. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that catabolic and anabolic processes differ in their responses to variations in soil parameters.

The most pronounced result of the PCA analysis was the separation of the catabolic response variables (BR$_{diff}$ and SIR) and the anabolic response variable exponential growth ($\mu$). BR$_{diff}$ and SIR were highly correlated with each other and described only by PC1 (fig. 2), i.e. they provide similar information about the microbial response to the experimental variables. The effect of the experimental variables on $\mu$ was only correlated to PC2 and uncorrelated to BR$_{diff}$ and SIR (fig. 2). The experimental variables surface pH (pH$_S$) and surface charge density (SCD) were highly correlated to PC1 and thus to the microbial response variables correlated to PC1 (SIR, BR$_{diff}$ and lag time, and somewhat less to R$_{max}$) (fig. 2). The interaction term between pH$_S$ and SCD correlated only to PC2 and was therefore, together with pH$_S$, most influential on the exponential growth ($\mu$) (fig. 2). The PCA analysis revealed that the fundamental difference between catabolic and anabolic processes was reflected in the differences in their responses to variations in soil conditions.

*Figure 2.* Loading plot, i.e. the relationships between variables, based on the principal component analysis (PCA) of the data on the microbial response variables and experimental variables (only data from samples with no pesticide or with dichlobenil included). The two components together explained 56% of the variance; PC1 33% and PC2 23%.
Effects of the soil parameters on microbial response variables (Papers I and II)

Overall, increasing the pH had a significant positive effect on both the catabolic and anabolic response variables. For example: Basal respiration rate (BR) increased from $0.04 \pm 0.00$ (average $\pm$ 95 % confidence interval, n=24) at native pH (4.1) to $0.14 \pm 0.00$ at the higher pH (7.3) (Paper I), while substrate-induced respiration (SIR) was increased about two-fold (fig. 3b) (Paper I); exponential growth ($\mu$) was increased by 45 % and lag time was reduced by $\geq 50\%$ (fig. 3b and d) (Paper I).

![Figure 3](image_url)

*Figure 3.* Effects of dichlobenil and BAM [500 mg g$^{-1}$ OM] and 2,4-DCP [30 mg g$^{-1}$ OM] at pH 4.1 [white] and 7.3 [grey] on the measured kinetic variables. (a) difference in respiration (BR$_{\text{dif}}$) rate before and after pesticide addition, (b) SIR, (c) $\mu$, (d) lag time, and (e) cumulative CO$_2$ production following glucose + N + P addition, after 58 and 31 h at pH 4.1 and 7.3, respectively. Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$).

The positive effects of increasing the pH on the microbial variables could be associated with many different processes in the soil. For instance, if the pH is increased the microorganisms should theoretically gain more energy from the proton gradients across their membranes, which should favour both catabolic and
anabolic responses. Another favourable effect of increases in pH is that they tend to increase the activities of many soil enzymes (Niemi & Vepsalainen, 2005). Increasing the pH also tends to make the structure of the soil humus looser, thereby increasing the availability of sorbed or bound organic compounds and cations to microorganisms (McBride, 1994). For the catabolic responses this is likely to have had a substantial effect, although the nutrient additions themselves probably had greater effects on the anabolic responses.

*Figure 4.* Effects of the significant interaction between surface pH and SCD on the microbial response variables. The symbols represent no pesticide addition [diamonds] and pesticide addition [triangles] at high SCD [black] and low SCD [white]: (a) BR and (with dichlobenil additions) (b) SIR, (c) μ, (d) lag time, (e) $R_{\text{max}}$ and (with 2,4-DCP additions) (f) $BR_{\text{diff}}$ and (g) SIR.
Microbial metabolic processes were found to differ in their responses to changes in the soil SCD (fig. 2). Substrate-induced respiration was positively correlated with SCD independently of surface pH (fig. 4b), indicating that the activity of enzymes involved in substrate degradation was increased by increases in SCD. This conclusion is consistent with previous findings showing that enzyme activity can be enhanced following sorption (Ahn et al., 2002), which increases with the net charge of the surface (Bolan et al., 1999). Sorption of enzymes onto soil surfaces can increase their sustainability (Nannipieri et al., 1996), however sorption is also commonly related to reduced effective activity (Paul & Clark, 1996). Increased SCD may also have promoted sorption of the substrates (Bolan et al. 1999), thereby increasing their availability for the microorganisms.

All of the variables used to describe soil microbial activity were highly dependent on SCD and surface pH. Furthermore, the impact of each of these factors was highly dependent on the value of the other. Under conditions in which catabolic processes (and associated parameters like BR) dominate, access to a readily available carbon or nutrient source would not be as important for the microorganisms as it is under anabolic process-promoting conditions. Thus, the finding that increasing SCD had similar affects on BR at both investigated surface pH levels (fig. 4a) is consistent with theoretical expectations. At a low level of SCD, surface pH was highly influential on BR, possibly at least partly because the activities of exoenzymes in soil are pH-dependent (Niemi & Vepsäläinen, 2005) (fig. 4a). Anabolic variables ($\mu$, lag time and $R_{\text{max}}$) showed unambiguous responses to the interaction between surface charge density and surface pH. High SCD was more favourable at the high level of surface pH and the low level of SCD was more favourable at the low level of surface pH (fig. 4c-e). The positive anabolic responses to the interactive effects of high SCD and surface pH correspond to the effects of the two soil variables in isolation, as discussed above. Another factor that could have enhanced the positive anabolic response to the advantageous interactive effects of low SCD and pH under these conditions is the high activity of enzymes whose activities are not positively correlated with sorption (George et al., 2005) and that have low pH optima (Niemi & Vepsäläinen, 2005).

**Effects of the pesticides on microbial metabolism and their interactions with the soil parameters (Papers I and II)**

Additions of BAM had significant negative effects on both catabolic ($p_{\text{SIR}}=0.006$) and anabolic processes ($p_{\text{BAM}}<0.001$, $p_{\text{cumulatedCO}_2}<0.001$) (table 3) (paper I). Dichlobenil additions also negatively affected microbial catabolic (fig. 4b) and anabolic processes ($p_{\text{cumulatedCO}_2}<0.001$) (fig. 3e and 4c-d) (paper I-II), but additions of 2,4-DCP had the strongest negative effect on microbial metabolism, severely affecting both catabolic and anabolic processes ($p<0.001$) (Paper I).
Table 3. Microbial respiration responses to the pesticides before and after glucose + N + P addition, the values represent average and 95% confidence intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pesticide</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>mg g⁻¹ OM dw</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Δ mg CO₂ g⁻¹ OM</th>
<th>mg CO₂ h⁻¹ g⁻¹ OM</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>mg CO₂ g⁻¹ OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dichlobenil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.01 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
<td>17.7 ± 2.2</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.02</td>
<td>15.9 ± 3.8</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.01</td>
<td>12.1 ± 6.1</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
<td>49.2 ± 3.3 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.02 ± 0.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.01</td>
<td>9.3 ± 1.2</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-0.03 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.01</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>-0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.00</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.01</td>
<td>41.7 ± 1.7 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.02 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.00</td>
<td>17.9 ± 3.6</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.00</td>
<td>12.1 ± 6.1</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.00</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.01</td>
<td>26.7 ± 1.5 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.02 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
<td>10.1 ± 2.3</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.33 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.33 ± 0.01</td>
<td>26.7 ± 1.5 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-DCP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.02 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
<td>17.7 ± 2.2</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.03 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
<td>19.3 ± 3.6</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.03</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.03</td>
<td>63.8 ± 10.3 c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Missing value, n=1
2. Exponential growth occurred in only one replicate
3. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) between interactions.

- **BR**: Biological respiration
- **SIR**: Specific microbial respiration
Initially, toxic effects of 2,4-DCP additions were more pronounced on the catabolic processes at the raised pH than in incubations at the native pH (table 3, fig. 3a). However, after the addition of substrate (glucose) and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphate), increased pH seemed to reduce the toxic effect of the additions of 2,4-DCP (table 3, fig. 3b-e). A probable contributory factor to the stronger effect of 2,4-DCP at the lower pH is that 2,4-DCP most readily enters cells in its undissociated form, and at the raised pH (7.3) approximately 20 % of the added 2,4-DCP (pKₐ 7.85) should theoretically have been in its anionic form. Although 2,4-DCP anions are also capable of passing through the microbial membrane, the proportions entering cells at pH 7.0 have been found to be minor (1%) and insufficient to cause measurable uncoupling activity (Escher et al., 1996). The amount of the anionic form available to enter the microbial cells is further reduced by sorption, which is strongly correlated to the soil organic content (Schellenberg et al., 1984). This also applies to the undissociated form, but the sorption kinetics and equilibrium states of the two forms differ, and are strongly influenced by various environmental factors. These theoretical considerations and empirical observations indicate that, in the system studied, at the raised pH some of the 2,4-DCP was in its dissociated form, which may explain at least some of its lower toxicity at this pH.

In contrast to 2,4-DCP, dichlobenil and BAM are stable in the pH range studied (EPA, 1998). Thus, the impact of pH on microbial responses to dichlobenil and BAM can be attributed to the effects on soil organic matter properties on the pesticides per se and/or their direct or indirect effects on microorganisms. In addition, dichlobenil had more pronounced effects on microbial metabolism (cumulative CO₂ respiration) at native pH (table 3, fig. 3e). Due to its hydrophobicity, dichlobenil partitions more strongly to the surface of the soil particles than into the soil solution. At native pH the soil organic matter had a lower net surface charge and was more hydrophobic than at the raised pH. This may have contributed to the difference in inhibitory effects of dichlobenil on the microorganisms at low and high pH. In contrast, BAM affected microbial metabolic processes most strongly at the raised pH (table 3). The negative effect of BAM on microbial metabolism indicated that the amide interacted with the microorganisms and inhibited the synthesis of new cells. Raising the pH of the soil solution increases the sorption parameters of the soil organic matter by increasing the negative charge density of the soil surface (Bolan et al., 1999). Increasing the soil surface charge density slightly positively affects the generally quite weak surface sorption of BAM (Clausen et al., 2004), which may explain the increased negative effect of BAM on microbial metabolism at the higher pH.

In accordance with the theoretical considerations outlined in Paper I, the negative effects of dichlobenil additions on the catabolic response represented by SIR were also reduced at the high level of SCD (fig. 4b). The effects of the interaction between SCD and pH₅ on the anabolic responses to the presence of dichlobenil followed the pattern observed in the absence of pesticide (fig. 4c-e). However, the negative effect of the dichlobenil additions was weaker when SCD and pH₅ were high, further supporting the theoretical considerations discussed in Paper I.
A low level of SCD in combination with low pH₅₆ eliminated the toxic effect of 2,4-DCP additions on basal respiration (BR₆₀₆₀) (fig. 4f). These results are in agreement with the findings presented in Paper I, and might have been due to low microbial metabolic activity under these conditions. However, at the raised pH₅₆, the SCD seemed to have little influence (fig. 4f). Thus, the adverse uncoupling activity of 2,4-DCP appears to exceed the stimulatory effects of possible increases in catabolic enzyme activity under these soil conditions.

**Effect of sorption on the microbial degradation of glyphosate (Paper III)**

Glyphosate is an intensively studied biodegradable pesticide that can be utilized by microorganisms as a carbon (C) substrate (Haney et al., 2000, Busse et al., 2001) and as a source of both nitrogen (N) (Haney et al., 2000) and phosphorous (P) (Dick & Quinn, 1995, Krzyśko-Lupicka & Orlik, 1997). When sorbed to goethite we hypothesized that glyphosate bioavailability would be reduced. However, in the respiration experiments where the microbial availability of glyphosate-P and glyphosate-N with and without goethite was tested, no evidence for utilization of N or P derived from glyphosate was obtained (fig. 5a-d). Furthermore, the microbial anabolic response was inhibited by the glyphosate additions irrespective of goethite additions. However, sorption of glyphosate to goethite reduced the harmful effects of glyphosate (fig. 5b and d). Similar results were obtained in the respiration experiments with glyphosate as a carbon source; glyphosate inhibited both catabolic and anabolic processes, however the negative effect was reduced by the presence of goethite. Nevertheless, analysis with ATR-FTIR spectroscopy confirmed that the microorganisms could utilize glyphosate sorbed to goethite as a source of carbon through de-carboxylation (fig. 6b). The decrease in BR observed with higher glyphosate additions suggests that energy generation from the breakdown of organic substrates is inhibited by glyphosate. It also had a major impact on microbial growth, indicating that glyphosate, or its metabolites, negatively affected anabolic activity. This effect remained at higher glyphosate doses even after prolonged incubation (Paper III). More detailed ATR-FTIR spectroscopy analysis of the phosphonate region revealed that sorbed glyphosate appeared to be further oxidized to orthophosphate, which at least partly remained as surface complexes on the goethite (fig. 7g).

In the experiments with glyphosate as a carbon source the highest glyphosate addition (10⁵ μg g⁻¹ OM) could have induced a 2-fold increase in the respiration rate, which would have been easily detectable. This, however, was not the case, and contrasts with the results presented by Busse et al. (2001), where increased CO₂ respiration rates were detected within a similar time period using forest humus soils and glyphosate additions similar to those tested here. Previous laboratory studies have found that glyphosate has harmful effects on microorganisms (Krzyśko-Lupicka & Orlik, 1997, Christy et al., 1981, Quinn et al., 1988). Our results are in agreement with these findings, indicating that glyphosate has negative effects on the microbial anabolic processes. These results,
however, conflict with those of many other studies indicating that glyphosate has a positive effect on microbial growth (e.g. Busse et al., 2001).

**Figure 5.** Microbial respiration responses to additions of glyphosate in combination with (a) glucose and N without goethite; (b) glucose and N with goethite; (c) glucose and P without goethite; and (d) glucose. Diamonds denote controls without glyphosate and the arrow denotes the time of addition.

**Figure 6.** ATR-FTIR spectra of (a) glyphosate on goethite at pH 4.6, (b) glyphosate on goethite added to soil, (c) glyphosate on goethite added to with soil + glucose and N.
Figure 7. ATR-FTIR spectra of (a) orthophosphate on goethite at pH 2.9, (b) orthophosphate on goethite at pH 6.3, (c) orthophosphate on goethite at pH 9.8, (d) suspension used for the soil experiments containing orthophosphate on goethite at pH 4.6, (e) orthophosphate on goethite added to soil, (f) orthophosphate on goethite added to soil + glucose and N, (g) glyphosate on goethite added to soil + glucose and N.

Implications of the results and future research priorities

No other group of organisms is as essential for all of the other organisms in an ecosystem as the microorganisms. Their versatility and ability to adapt to changes in the environment is the key to their importance and success. The main implication of the results from these studies on microorganisms and their interactions with soil properties is that various soil parameters have differing effects on catabolic and anabolic microbial processes; one set of soil parameters may be more beneficial for catabolic processes while another is more beneficial for anabolic processes.

This raises questions about the optimal conditions for the microorganisms. In most soils growth is slow and maintaining the existing population should be the key objective in attempts to promote soil vitality. A key issue to address, therefore, is whether soil conditions favouring catabolic processes or conditions favouring the growth of microorganisms are most beneficial for promoting the survival and desirable functions of the microbial population.

Generally, the microbial metabolic responses in soils with contrasting properties followed the same patterns in both the presence and absence of the tested pesticides, with the exception of 2,4-DCP. However, the results for all pesticides indicate that in soil conditions that are most favourable for microbial metabolism the pesticides have the weakest negative effects. These results were obtained in
tests with a soil microbial population originating from soil that was rich in organic matter and had a naturally acidic pH. Therefore, further important issues to explore are whether soil microorganisms originating from other types of soil respond in a similar way, and whether the degradation or transformation of pesticides is more strongly promoted by their retention in organic matter-rich soils with a highly active microbial community than in other types of soil.

Sorption of a compound to a soil particle is often considered to strongly limit its microbial availability. However, these studies indicate that although sorption can delay the degradation of a compound, it also reduces the negative effects of glyphosate on microbial metabolism. Moreover, the results imply that even when sorbed to goethite, glyphosate can be fully mineralized by the microorganisms. Since goethite is a common mineral in many soils these findings should be applicable to various field conditions. In further attempts to explain biogeochemical processes combining analyses of microbial respiration kinetics with molecular level processes will be of great significance.

**Major conclusions**

**General conclusions**

- The general view of the relationship between pH and soil microbial processes is that a close to neutral pH is most beneficial for microbial activities. However, the studies this thesis is based upon clearly demonstrate that the effect of pH on soil microbial processes is highly variable and a lower pH, even in the acid range, may be favourable.

- The effect of pH on the soil microbial metabolism is highly dependent on the surface properties of the inorganic and organic fractions of the soil, as exemplified by the surface charge densities.

- The pH and surface charge properties of soils have differing effects on different components of microbial metabolism.

- The interactions between microbial metabolism and pesticides are highly dependent on both the pH and soil particle surface charge density along with interactions between the two.

**More detailed conclusions are:**

- Soil surface charge density (SCD) and SOM surface pH (pH₃) interactively affect microbial metabolism; at a high level of SCD an increase in pH₃ is favourable and at a low level of SCD a decrease in pH₃ is most beneficial.

- A low level of SCD in combination with low pH₃ eliminates the toxic effect of 2,4-DCP additions on basal respiration (BRₙₐ₅). However,
increasing pH in the presence of 2,4-DCP severely affected basal respiration, independently of the SCD.

- Raising the pH reduced the toxic effects of 2,4-DCP on microbial anabolic processes.
- High levels of SCD and surface pH reduced the negative effects of dichlobenil on microbial metabolism.
- BAM had a greater negative effect on the microbial anabolic processes at neutral than at acid pH.
- Dichlobenil had a greater negative effect on the microbial anabolic processes at acid than at neutral pH.
- Glyphosate sorbed onto goethite is a microbially available source of C, N and possibly P.
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Vänner långt bort, men ändå alltid nära, tack för att ni alltid finns när det behövs!

Avkoppling och middager med min ”ume/vägsele släkt” har varit ett mycket välkommet och välbehövligt inslag, tack för all omtanke!

Min familj, hemma bra, men hemhemma bäst! Alltid lika härligt att få åka hem till Falun eller till Farmor i Askersund, bättre sätt att ladda batterierna på fins inte!

Utan Skype i tre dagar försmäktar jag i denna värld! Pär, tack för allt stöd via cyber-jyyymden, du är helt fantastisk!!