

Environment and host as large-scale controls of ectomycorrhizal fungi

Article

Accepted Version

van der Linde, S., Suz, L. M., Orme, C. D. L., Cox, F., Andreae, H., Asi, E., Atkinson, B., Benham, S., Carroll, C., Cools, N., De Vos, B., Dietrich, H.-P., Eichhorn, J., Gehrmann, J., Grebenc, T., Gweon, H. S. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6218-6301>, Hansen, K., Jacob, F., Kristöfel, F., Lech, P., Manninger, M., Martin, J., Meesenburg, H., Merilä, P., Nicolas, M., Pavlenda, P., Rautio, P., Schaub, M., Schröck, H.-W., Seidling, W., Šrámek, V., Thimonier, A., Thomsen, I. M., Titeux, H., Vanguelova, E., Verstraeten, A., Vesterdal, L., Waldner, P., Wijk, S., Zhang, Y., Žlindra, D. and Bidartondo, M. I. (2018) Environment and host as large-scale controls of ectomycorrhizal fungi. *Nature*, 558. pp. 243-248. ISSN 0028-0836 doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0189-9 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/77579/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0189-9>

Publisher: Nature Publishing Group

Publisher statement: In the HTML version of this Article, author 'Filipa Cox' had no affiliation in the author list, although she was correctly associated with

affiliation 3 (Earth & Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK) in the PDF. In addition, the blue circles for 'oak' were missing from Extended Data Fig. 1. These errors have been corrected online.

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Environment and host as large-scale controls of ectomycorrhizal fungi**

2

3 **Authors**

4 Sietse van der Linde^{1,2,3}, Laura M. Suz², C. David L. Orme¹, Filipa Cox⁴, Henning Andreae⁵,
5 Endla Asi⁶, Bonnie Atkinson^{1,2}, Sue Benham⁷, Christopher Carroll¹, Nathalie Cools⁸, Bruno
6 De Vos⁸, Hans-Peter Dietrich⁹, Johannes Eichhorn¹⁰, Joachim Germann¹¹, Tine Grebenc¹²,
7 Hyun S. Gweon¹³, Karin Hansen¹⁴, Frank Jacob¹⁵, Ferdinand Kristöfel¹⁶, Paweł Lech¹⁷,
8 Miklós Manninger¹⁸, Jan Martin¹⁹, Henning Meesenburg¹⁰, Päivi Merilä²⁰, Manuel Nicolas²¹,
9 Pavel Pavlenda²², Pasi Rautio²³, Marcus Schaub²⁴, Hans-Werner Schröck²⁵, Walter
10 Seidling²⁶, Vít Šrámek²⁷, Anne Thimonier²⁴, Iben Margrete Thomsen²⁸, Hugues Titeux²⁹,
11 Elena Vanguelova⁷, Arne Verstraeten³⁰, Lars Vesterdal²⁸, Peter Waldner²⁴, Sture Wijk³¹,
12 Yuxin Zhang¹, Daniel Žlindra¹², Martin I. Bidartondo^{1,2}

13

14 ¹Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot SL5 7PY, UK.

15 ²Comparative Plant and Fungal Biology, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew TW9 3DS, UK.

16 ³Forest Research, Ecosystems, Society and Biosecurity, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham GU35
17 4LH, UK (present address).

18 ⁴Earth & Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK.

19 ⁵Public Enterprise Sachsenforst, Kompetenzzentrum Wald und Forstwirtschaft, Bonnewitzer
20 Straße 34, 01796 Pirna, Germany.

21 ⁶Estonian Environment Agency, Mustamäe tee 33, Tallinn, Estonia 10616.

22 ⁷Forest Research, Forestry and Climate Change, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham GU35 4LH, UK.

23 ⁸Nature and Forest Research Institute, Environment and Climate, Gaverstraat 4, 9500
24 Geraardsbergen, Belgium.

25 ⁹Bavarian State Forestry Institute, Hans-Carl-von-Carlowitz-Platz 1, D-85354 Freising,
26 Germany.

27 ¹⁰Northwest German Forest Research Institute, Grätzelstrasse 2, D-37079 Göttingen,
28 Germany.

29 ¹¹Landesamt für Natur Umwelt und Verbraucherschutz Nordrhein-Westfalen, Leibnitzstrasse
30 10, 45659 Recklinghausen, Germany.

31 ¹²Slovenian Forestry Institution, Večna pot 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

32 ¹³Biological Sciences, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6UR, UK.

33 ¹⁴IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, 100 31 Stockholm, Sweden.

34 ¹⁵Staatsbetrieb Sachsenforst, Referat 43, Bonnewitzer Str. 34, 01796 Pirna, Germany.

35 ¹⁶Federal Research and Training Centre for Forests, Natural Hazards and Landscape (BFW)
36 Seckendorff-Gudent-Weg 8, 1131 Wien, Austria.

37 ¹⁷Forest Research Institute, Sękocin Stary, Braci Leśnej 3, 05-090 Raszyn, Poland.

38 ¹⁸NARIC Forest Research Institute, Várkerület 30/a, 9600 Sárvár, Hungary.

39 ¹⁹Landesforstanstalt M-V BT: FVI, Zeppelinstr. 3, 19061 Schwerin, Germany.

40 ²⁰Natural Resources Institute Finland, Paavo Havaksentie 3, 90570 Oulu, Finland.

41 ²¹Office National des Forêts, Recherche-Développement-Innovation, Bâtiment B, Boulevard
42 de Constance, 77300 Fontainebleau, France.

43 ²²National Forest Centre, T.G. Masaryka 22, 96092 Zvolen, Slovakia.

44 ²³Natural Resources Institute Finland, Eteläranta 55, FI-96301 Rovaniemi, Finland.

45 ²⁴Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research, Zürcherstrasse 111, CH-
46 8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland.

47 ²⁵Forschungsanstalt für Waldökologie und Forstwirtschaft, Hauptstr. 16, 67705 Trippstadt,
48 Germany.

49 ²⁶Thünen Institute of Forest Ecosystems, Alfred-Möller-Str. 1, Haus 41/42, 16341
50 Eberswalde, Germany.
51 ²⁷Forestry and Game Management Research Institute, Strnady 136, 252 02 Jíloviště, Czech
52 Republic.
53 ²⁸Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej
54 23, DK-1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark.
55 ²⁹University of Louvain, Earth and Life Institute, Croix du Sud 2, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve,
56 Belgium.
57 ³⁰Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek, Kliniekstraat 25, 1070 Brussels, Belgium.
58 ³¹Swedish Forest Agency, S-551 83 Jönköping, Sweden.

59

60 **Explaining the large-scale diversity of soil organisms that drive biogeochemical**
61 **processes and their responses to environmental change is critical. However, identifying**
62 **consistent drivers of below-ground diversity and abundance at large spatial scales**
63 **remains problematic for some soil organisms. We investigated a major guild, the**
64 **ectomycorrhizal fungi, at unprecedented scale and resolution across European forests to**
65 **explore key biotic and abiotic predictors, and to identify dominant responses and**
66 **thresholds across complex environmental gradients. Here we show the impact of 38**
67 **host, environment, climate and geographic variables on ectomycorrhizal diversity, and**
68 **we define thresholds of community change for key variables. We quantify host**
69 **specificity and reveal plasticity in functional traits involved in soil foraging across**
70 **gradients. We conclude that environmental and host factors explain most variation in**
71 **ectomycorrhizal diversity, the environmental thresholds used as major ecosystem**
72 **assessment tools need strong adjustment, and the importance of specificity and**
73 **plasticity below-ground has been underappreciated.**

74 The main projected impacts of environmental change on forest processes stem from global
75 and regional perturbations in the carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) cycles^{1,2} and declines in soil
76 biodiversity^{3,4}. Globally, mycorrhizal mutualisms mediate soil processes in terrestrial
77 ecosystems⁵ and are major drivers of ecosystem C and N dynamics⁶. Soil C sequestration^{7,8},
78 tree population dynamics⁹ and mitigation of CO₂ fertilization¹⁰ have recently been linked to
79 ectomycorrhizal (EM) symbioses, ubiquitous drivers of photosynthetic C exchange for soil
80 nutrients across temperate and boreal forests¹¹.

81 How changes in ecosystem processes are underpinned by EM fungi is poorly understood, but
82 likely large-scale effects of those changes, e.g. deteriorating tree mineral nutrition and health,
83 are being observed^{12,13}. Various ecological processes are only apparent at large spatial
84 scales¹⁴, and there is concern about lacking baseline EM distribution data against which to
85 assess effects of global change^{15,16}. Ectomycorrhizal research has emphasized laboratory or
86 local-scale studies, often reliant on few culturable fungi, to provide mechanistic
87 understanding of symbiotic physiology. However, determinants of EM diversity at local
88 scales are not necessarily their primary drivers at larger scales¹⁷, and EM communities are
89 often dominated by hardly culturable and non- or inconspicuously-fruiting fungi¹⁸.

90 Furthermore, EM community composition, richness, fine root biomass and morphology¹⁹⁻²¹
91 and fungal above-ground fruiting²² indicate different large-scale patterns and responses from
92 plants and animals; and EM richness increases with sample area more than for microbes^{17,23}.

93 Consequently, there have been repeated calls for unbiased, large-scale, molecular, ecosystem-
94 level baseline data on EM fungi^{15,18,20,24}. Elucidating large-scale EM diversity is crucial for
95 appropriate experimental design in ecosystem science and model organism selection for
96 experimental and comparative biology²⁵.

97 Unlike multiple local-scale studies where EM fungi are strongly determined by soil
98 environment^{26,27}, recent large-scale biogeographical studies report that, other than host

identity, soil, climate and atmospheric deposition explain remarkably limited variability²⁸⁻³³ (Supplementary Information Table 1). Most EM fungi are thought to have broad host ranges, even though specialists can be widespread; but specificity is rarely quantified below-ground at large scales³⁴. Current EM environmental thresholds rarely integrate occurrence, abundance and directionality of taxon responses, statistical analysis of large-scale standardized datasets, or studies of low pollution sites^{16,35,36}. Critical loads are essential tools for international atmospheric emissions control^{37,38}, but for EM fungi they differ markedly between Europe and North America³⁶. In addition, EM physiological and morphological plasticity are thought to enhance soil nutrient uptake of trees across environmental gradients³⁹; however, foraging-related functional traits are assumed fixed at species- or genus-levels. Wide gradients with abundant observations are needed to link plasticity and environment. We conducted a detailed mycorrhizal analysis using one of the world's largest and most intensive long-term monitoring networks of soil, atmospheric and vegetation parameters. We analysed 38 variables at 137 plots in 20 European countries across strong environmental gradients. We expected to (1) disentangle significant variability explained by co-varying climatic, soil and atmospheric deposition factors, (2) test the generality of host specificity, (3) detect precise thresholds of mycorrhizal change to inform environmental policy, and (4) infer trait plasticity linked to key environmental gradients.

Results

We examined 29,664 ectomycorrhizas from 9,888 soil cores from 103 plots of ca. 0.25 ha in 18 European countries. Including data from 34 plots from Cox et al.¹⁸ and Suz et al.¹⁶, resulted in 39,621 ectomycorrhizas from 137 plots in 20 countries across ca. 5.5 million km² (Fig. 1). After removing short low-quality (12,038), chimeric (231), non-mycorrhizal (848)

and unknown (1,308) ITS DNA sequences, we retained 25,196 resulting in 1,406 EM fungal operational taxonomic units (OTUs), 82% Basidiomycota and 18% Ascomycota (Fig 2); 914 were recorded more than once, and 90% were identified to genus or a higher taxonomic level, of which 47% were identified to species.

Composition and specificity

We explained 38% of variance in community composition with forward-selected variables according to the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). Variables were divided in four partitions: host variables, soil+deposition, climate, and geographic distance (Supplementary Table 2). Nine host variables explained most overall community variance (23%), followed by soil+deposition (21%), geographic distance (14%) and climatic variables (12%). The partitions shared 20% of overall explained variance (Fig. 3).

We used global non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordinations to visualize EM fungal community composition and we fitted environmental variables to the ordination to find the most influential variables (Extended Data Fig. 1, Extended Data Table 1). Thus, we identified five key variables for subsequent analyses: N throughfall deposition (N_{TFD}), forest floor pH, mean annual air temperature (MAT), K throughfall deposition (K_{TFD}) and foliar N:P ratio ($N:P_F$).

Almost two-thirds (62%) of ectomycorrhizas correspond to fungi that produce above-ground mushroom-like fruitbodies, the rest produce inconspicuous truffles, crusts or sclerotia. Based on abundance, 48% were generalists and 52% specialists to coniferous or broadleaf hosts.

Only 7% of ectomycorrhizas were from specialists to one host tree species. Of the 88 OTUs forming 50 or more ectomycorrhizas, 41% were generalists and 60% coniferous or broadleaf specialists; eleven OTUs (12.5%) were specific to one host species.

Indicators, thresholds and plasticity

Threshold indicator species analyses identified decreasing (z-) and increasing indicator OTUs (z+) for all five key environmental variables (Fig. 4, Extended Data Fig. 2). We identified environmental thresholds of EM fungal community change by cumulating z- and z+ change points. For N_{TFD} we found a sum(z-) peak at $5.8 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and a sum(z+) peak at $15.5 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. For $N:P_F$ we detected peaks at 10.2 and 13.3 for sum(z-) and sum(z+), respectively. We found a sum(z-) peak at $6.9 \text{ kg K ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and an indistinct sum(z+) peak at $21.7 \text{ kg K ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for K_{TFD} . There was a distinct peak for forest floor pH for sum(z-) and sum(z+) at 3.8. Indicator OTUs showed a clear threshold of change for MAT, with a 7.4°C z- peak and a distinct 9.1°C z+ peak. Most z- for N_{TFD} , $N:P_F$, K deposition, forest floor pH and MAT were conifer specialists while all z+ were generalists or broadleaf associates. Generally, threshold values based on accumulated change-points of individual taxa were less pronounced at genus than OTU level (Extended Data Fig. 3).

The observed frequencies of ectomycorrhizas with emanating hyphae and those with rhizomorphs differed significantly between tree species ($P < 0.0001$, $df = 3$) and soil types ($P < 0.0001$, $df = 5$; Extended Data Table 2ab); hyphal frequencies were higher than expected with beech and spruce and in Fe-Al soils, respectively. Thirty of the 88 most abundant OTUs (≥ 50 ectomycorrhizas) showed morphological plasticity and 26 of them were also indicators for a key environmental variable. The change in morphology of 17 of those EM taxa was significantly related with at least one environmental variable (Extended Data Tables 3a, 4a). Morphological plasticity related to at least one variable was found within 12 OTUs when a more stringent 99% sequence similarity was used (Extended Data Tables 3b, 4b).

Intraspecific plasticity of individual indicator EM fungi does not necessarily follow overall community morphological changes where logistic regressions showed that mean N_{TFD} was positively related with hyphal presence ($P < 0.0001$). There was negative correlation between

hyphal presence and forest floor pH, N:P_F and K_{TFD}, but no correlation with MAT (Extended Data Table 5). Community-wide, we found negative correlation between rhizomorph presence and all tested environmental variables (Extended Data Table 5).

Discussion

This is the first large-scale high-resolution study of diversity and distribution of below-ground tree symbionts covering all major European climatic regions for the most abundant tree species. We explain considerable large-scale mycorrhizal diversity with an unprecedented range and quality of environmental, host-related, climatic and geographic variables. We identify large-scale environmental predictors, show the dominance of host specificity, determine environmental indicators and new thresholds of change, and reveal morphological plasticity along environmental gradients. These findings serve as a baseline to assess future change and resilience.

Host-related, soil and atmospheric deposition variables were the most important predictors of EM community structure across Europe. Four recent large-scale studies^{29,31-33} found these variables to be minor predictors, even though in local-scale studies soil environment shows strong effects^{26,27}. We distinguished five key environmental variables: N_{TFD}, N:P_F, forest floor pH, K_{TFD} and MAT. Across previous large-scale studies, there is agreement that host species and soil pH are important, but results about other variables disagree (Supplementary Information Table 1). Inconsistent large-scale drivers of diversity and abundance have been reported across different microbes⁴⁰, but host is also fundamental for prokaryotes at macroecological scales⁴¹. Environmental effects on EM fungi in previous studies have probably been confounded by: (i) environmental variables from modelled or extrapolated regional sources; (ii) non-standardized sampling and spatial pseudo-replication; (iii) indirect assignment of mycorrhizal status and traits using databases (e.g. UNITE, FunGuild,

DEEMY); (iv) semi-quantitative analysis of short DNA sequences; and (v) pooling DNA samples from root hyphae, soil hyphae and dormant propagules even though EM spore banks differ strongly from active communities on roots at local and large scales⁴², and ephemeral above-ground reproductive structures and soil hyphae correspond weakly with active communities on roots^{43,44}. As a result, up to 90% of variation in EM diversity at large scales has remained unexplained by environmental models³³. The approach used here is considered more robust⁴⁵ and generates higher quality data⁴⁶, but had yet to be scaled up due to technical challenges. The large unexplained part of community structure may be attributed to unaccounted factors such as disturbance, management history, stochasticity, interactions among variables masking individual effects, measurement and analytical errors, exclusion of rare species, seasonality, using taxonomic instead of functional diversity, and/or not covering complete gradients of each variable across whole geographic ranges of hosts and fungi. In our study, conifers have larger distribution and thus cover larger environmental gradients that likely explain the different number of environmental variables linked to community dissimilarities among hosts.

Host-related variables strongly influence EM fungal communities, thus symbiosis plays a major role in shaping EM distributions. Studies on host specificity of EM fungi at large scales have been mainly based on fruitbody surveys and thus assess specificity on taxonomic rather than abundance levels⁴⁷. Host generalism is considered the rule⁴⁸, but intensive below-ground analysis indicates EM fungal specificity to the most common European trees matches or exceeds generalism on taxonomic and relative abundance levels, particularly for conifers. We find more conifer specialists and they respond strongly to environmental gradients; the implications of specificity and abundance merit investigation, as they can reflect, respectively, more^{34,49} and less⁵⁰ efficient nutritional mutualisms.

223 We use threshold indicator taxon analyses for the first time for fungi at a continental scale to
 224 identify distinct EM responses to key environmental variables and clear thresholds of change.
 225 Indicator species emerged for all key environmental variables, and several EM taxa were
 226 indicators for more than one. Different fungi within a family, and even a genus, can be both
 227 positive and negative indicators for a variable; for instance, *Thelephora terrestris* and
 228 *Tomentella castanea* are negative and positive indicators for N:P_F, respectively, and
 229 *Lactarius rufus* and *L. hepaticus* are negative and positive indicators for N_{TFD}, respectively.
 230 Nonetheless, genus-level analyses revealed most indicator species patterns hold true at higher
 231 taxonomic ranks (Extended Data Fig. 3). In some genera, the aggregate of species acts as
 232 indicator, although individual species do not (e.g. *Sistotrema*, *Clavulina* and *Boletus* for N_{TFD}
 233 and K_{TFD}). For several genera we find a different response to elevated N_{TFD} than previous
 234 studies, even those with consistent responses across studies⁵¹ (i.e. *Tomentella*, *Tylospora*,
 235 *Cenococcum*, *Hebeloma*, *Amanita*). Furthermore, we confirm the response to elevated N_{TFD}
 236 of several genera only recorded in few studies⁵¹ (i.e. *Clavulina*, *Elaphomyces*, *Boletus*,
 237 *Amphinema*).
 238 With increasing N availability, metabolically costly ways of obtaining N from complex soil
 239 organic sources are less cost-effective; fungi that utilise those pathways (e.g. *Cortinarius*,
 240 *Piloderma*, *Tricholoma*) are at a disadvantage compared to fungi that utilise inorganic N (e.g.
 241 *Elaphomyces*, *Laccaria*)⁵¹. Indeed, organic N users tended to be negative indicators for N
 242 deposition, and inorganic N users tended to be positive.
 243 Some indicator species for K_{TFD} are abundant and widespread in Europe (e.g. *Elaphomyces*
 244 *asperulus*, *Lactarius quietus*, *Piloderma sphaerosporum*); however, K_{TFD} has not been
 245 identified as a key variable in previous EM studies. A meta-analysis showed that in 69% of
 246 experiments tree growth responded positively to soil K increases⁵², but K is highly diffusible
 247 in soil and easily accessible for plants. Some K_{TFD} may originate from canopy leaching; with

acidifying pollution, K leaches, and if depleted in foliage and litter, K availability in soil organic matter could decrease. Moreover, K is taken up and translocated by EM fungi in a specific manner (e.g. EM fungi with hydrophobins transfer less K)¹¹. This agrees with our results; most negative indicator genera were hydrophobic and most positive ones hydrophilic⁵³.

Based on the large number of indicator species for MAT, climate should play an important role in shaping EM communities, as suggested by fruiting phenology studies⁵⁴. However, it is difficult to distinguish MAT from climate and therefore to know whether a fungus occurs somewhere because of prevalent temperatures. Nevertheless, current habitats may become less favourable for many EM fungi as temperature increases.

Accumulated change-point values of all individual EM fungi indicate environmental thresholds of change for most key environmental variables. There was a narrow range for fungi negatively affected by N_{TFD} with a sharp threshold at $5.8 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. These mainly conifer specialists thrive in poor soils and pre-industrial N levels (ca. $< 2 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), but cannot keep up with increased N_{TFD} from industrial, agricultural and transport emissions over the last decades. They are likely out-competed by fungi that use the additional inorganic N or avoid additional N uptake costs⁵⁵, particularly within the temperate distribution ranges of beech and oak where N_{TFD} is greatest, and organic N users show some recovery in fruiting if N pollution decreases⁵⁶. Positively-affected fungi, mostly host generalists lacking proteolytic abilities, initially do well with additional inorganic N, giving them a competitive advantage. However, their much broader response range and less defined peak at $15.5 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ suggests adaptation by positively-affected fungi to increased N_{TFD} varies greatly. This might be driven by geographically-divergent population-level evolutionary selection pressures on fungi since the industrial revolution. Furthermore, naturally enriched microsites (e.g. animal

latrines, carcasses, disturbances) and macrosites (e.g. stands with N₂ fixers) could have pre-adapted certain fungi.

We confirm and extend observations based on fruitbodies and roots at smaller scales⁵⁷ that conifer specialists - most with abundant hyphae and rhizomorphs - are more negatively affected by increasing N than broadleaf specialists and generalists. The strong differences observed in host specificity between fungi negatively- and positively-affected by N_{TFD} may be caused by differences in enzymatic capability to acquire N directly from complex soil organic compounds, thus circumventing mineralization, and in resource exchange rate, e.g. if specialists transfer more soil N per unit of tree C than generalists³⁴. Comparative genetic, physiological and ecological studies of the different sets of dominant indicators are now needed to test alternative models of EM community optimisation versus parasitism under changing C and N conditions⁵⁸ through species replacement, plasticity and/or evolution⁵⁹.

Large-scale below-ground analysis contributes important information on ecosystem assessment tools for a uniquely important guild of forest organisms. Critical loads for eutrophying N deposition were previously estimated for EM fungi, largely based on expert opinion and above-ground data, at 5-10 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for North America³⁶ and 10-20 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for Europe⁶⁰. Thresholds based on European EM data have focused on few sites across smaller gradients or EM richness and evenness instead of community composition^{16,35}. Our large N deposition gradient leads to a much lower European threshold value for a substantial EM shift at 5-6 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, based on both throughfall and open field deposition data, approaching recent lower estimates for other forest organisms^{61,62}. Caution is needed inferring absolute values for critical loads, but based on our results critical loads for European forests need strong adjustment towards those for North American forests, and EM and forest change thresholds need aligning to explain alarming deterioration in European tree nutrition¹³. Critical N:P_F are considered plant specific⁶³ and N:P_F has been linked to tree

health, with breakpoint values of 7.3 for conifers and 14.8 for broadleaf trees regarding defoliation¹². We show that lower (10.2) and upper (13.3) N:P_F thresholds for EM communities are linked to conifers and broadleaves, respectively. Community threshold forest floor pH levels for negative and positive indicator species overlap. Although soil pH is anthropogenically influenced (e.g. liming) and soil acidification affects parts of Europe⁶⁴, the major soil pH differences across forests arise from soil parent material and climatic differences over long timescales, and must have long influenced EM communities. Nonetheless, individual species could be affected. For K_{TFD}, no threshold values for EM composition have been published. We identify a 5-8 kg K ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ threshold for declining species; however, K_{TFD} results partly from K uptake and leaching by trees, which may be influenced by EM fungi themselves. Therefore, research into K deposition and cycling is needed for EM communities¹¹ and forests⁵². Physiological and morphological heterogeneity and plasticity of EM mycelium have been considered responsible for enabling trees to rapidly take up soil nutrients^{65,66}, here we show morphological plasticity within dominant EM taxa and changes over environmental gradients. This has significant implications for functional diversity studies at large-scales and/or across gradients. Indirect assignment of EM functional traits to taxonomic groups merits caution and their temporal variation merits investigation. We conclude that intensive and extensive organismal and environmental data collection, with multiple biotic and abiotic co-varying factors, reveals soil, atmospheric deposition and climate variables control large-scale patterns of species distributions in EM communities. Such data allow linking species and community responses to environmental thresholds acting across macroecological scales and deliver new insights into spatial variation in specificity and functional trait plasticity below-ground.

References

1. Canadell, J. G. *et al.* Contributions to accelerating atmospheric CO₂ growth from economic activity, carbon intensity, and efficiency of natural sinks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 18866–18870 (2007).
2. Galloway, J. N. *et al.* Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science* **320**, 889 (2008).
3. European Union Soil Thematic Strategy. COM(2006) 231 (2006).
4. Janssens, I. A. *et al.* Reduction of forest soil respiration in response to nitrogen deposition. *Nature Geosci* **3**, 315–322 (2010).
5. Johnson N. C., Jansa J. Mycorrhizas: At the interface of biological, soil and, earth sciences. *Mycorrhizal mediation of soil: Fertility, structure, and carbon storage*, 1-6 Elsevier, Amsterdam (2017).
6. Van der Heijden, M. G. A., Martin, F. M., Selosse, M.-A. & Sanders, I. R. Mycorrhizal ecology and evolution: the past, the present, and the future. *New Phytol.* **205**, 1406–1423 (2015).
7. Averill, C., Turner, B. L. & Finzi, A. C. Mycorrhiza-mediated competition between plants and decomposers drives soil carbon storage. *Nature* **505**, 543–545 (2014).
8. Clemmensen, K. E. *et al.* Roots and associated fungi drive long-term carbon sequestration in boreal forest. *Science* **339**, 1615–1618 (2013).
9. Bennett, J. A. *et al.* Plant-soil feedbacks and mycorrhizal type influence temperate forest population dynamics. *Science* **355**, 181–184 (2017).
10. Terrer, C., Vicca, S., Hungate, B. A., Phillips, R. P. & Prentice, I. C. Mycorrhizal association as a primary control of the CO₂ fertilization effect. *Science* **353**, 72–74 (2016).
11. Smith, S. E. & Read, D. E. *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*, 3rd edn. Academic, London (2008).

- 347 12. Veresoglou, S. D. *et al.* Exploring continental-scale stand health – N : P ratio
348 relationships for European forests. *New Phytol.* **202**, 422–430 (2014).
- 349 13. Jonard, M. *et al.* Tree mineral nutrition is deteriorating in Europe. *Glob. Change Biol.* **21**,
350 418–430 (2015).
- 351 14. Levin S. A. Multiple scales and the maintenance of biodiversity. *Ecosystems* **3**, 498–506
352 (2000).
- 353 15. Lilleskov, E. A. & Parrent, J. L. Can we develop general predictive models of
354 mycorrhizal fungal community–environment relationships? *New Phytol.* **174**, 250–256
355 (2007).
- 356 16. Suz, L. M. *et al.* Environmental drivers of ectomycorrhizal communities in Europe’s
357 temperate oak forests. *Mol. Ecol.* **23**, 5628–5644 (2014).
- 358 17. Peay, K. G., Matheny P. B. Biogeography of ectomycorrhizal Fungi. In *The molecular*
359 *mycorrhizal symbiosis*, F. Martin, ed. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 341–361. (2017).
- 360 18. Cox, F., Barsoum, N., Lilleskov, E. A. & Bidartondo, M. I. Nitrogen availability is a
361 primary determinant of conifer mycorrhizas across complex environmental gradients.
362 *Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 1103–1113 (2010).
- 363 19. Cudlin, P. *et al.* Fine roots and ectomycorrhizas as indicators of environmental change.
364 *Plant Biosyst.* **141**, 406–425 (2007).
- 365 20. Tedersoo, L. *et al.* Towards global patterns in the diversity and community structure of
366 ectomycorrhizal fungi. *Mol. Ecol.* **21**, 4160–4170 (2012).
- 367 21. Ostonen, I. *et al.* Adaptive root foraging strategies along a boreal–temperate forest
368 gradient. *New Phytol.* **215**, 977–991 (2017).
- 369 22. Kauserud, H. *et al.* Warming-induced shift in European mushroom fruiting phenology.
370 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 14488–14493 (2012).

- 371 23. Peay, K. G., Bruns, T. D., Kennedy, P. G., Bergemann, S. E. & Garbelotto, M. A strong
372 species–area relationship for eukaryotic soil microbes: island size matters for
373 ectomycorrhizal fungi. *Ecol. Lett.* **10**, 470–480 (2007).
- 374 24. Peay, K. G., Bidartondo, M. I. & Arnold, A. E. Not every fungus is everywhere: scaling
375 to the biogeography of fungal–plant interactions across roots, shoots and ecosystems.
376 *New Phytol.* **185**, 878–882 (2010).
- 377 25. Suz, L. M. *et al.* Monitoring ectomycorrhizal fungi at large scales for science, forest
378 management, fungal conservation and environmental policy. *Ann. For. Sci.* **72**, 877–885
379 (2015).
- 380 26. Peay, K. G., Kennedy, P. G., Davies, S. J., Tan, S. & Bruns, T. D. Potential link between
381 plant and fungal distributions in a dipterocarp rainforest: community and phylogenetic
382 structure of tropical ectomycorrhizal fungi across a plant and soil ecotone. *New Phytol.*
383 **185**, 529–542 (2010).
- 384 27. Taylor D. L., Hollingsworth T. N., McFarland J. W., Lennon N. J., Nusbaum C., Ruess R.
385 W. A first comprehensive census of fungi in soil reveals both hyperdiversity and fine-
386 scale niche partitioning. *Ecol. Monogr.* **84**, 3–20 (2014).
- 387 28. Bahram, M., Peay, K. G. & Tedersoo, L. Local-scale biogeography and spatiotemporal
388 variability in communities of mycorrhizal fungi. *New Phytol.* **205**, 1454–1463 (2015).
- 389 29. Kennedy, P. G., Garibay-Orijel, R., Higgins, L. M. & Angeles-Arguiz, R.
390 Ectomycorrhizal fungi in Mexican *Alnus* forests support the host co-migration hypothesis
391 and continental-scale patterns in phylogeography. *Mycorrhiza* **21**, 559–568 (2011).
- 392 30. Kennedy, P.G. *et al.* Scaling up: examining the macroecology of ectomycorrhizal fungi.
393 *Mol. Ecol.* **21**, 4151–4154 (2012).

- 394 31. Pöhlme, S. *et al.* Biogeography of ectomycorrhizal fungi associated with alders (*Alnus*
395 spp.) in relation to biotic and abiotic variables at the global scale. *New Phytol.* **198**, 1239–
396 1249 (2013).
- 397 32. Talbot, J. M. *et al.* Endemism and functional convergence across the North American soil
398 mycobiome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 6341–6346 (2014).
- 399 33. Tedersoo, L. *et al.* Global diversity and geography of soil fungi. *Science* **346**, 1256688
400 (2014).
- 401 34. Molina, R. & Horton, T. R. Mycorrhiza specificity: Its role in the development and
402 function of common mycelial networks. in *Mycorrhizal Networks* (ed. Horton, T. R.) 1–
403 39 (Springer Netherlands, 2015). doi:10.1007/978-94-017-7395-9_1.
- 404 35. De Witte, L. C., Rosenstock, N. P., van der Linde, S. & Braun, S. Nitrogen deposition
405 changes ectomycorrhizal communities in Swiss beech forests. *Sci. Total Environ.* **605–**
406 **606**, 1083–1096 (2017).
- 407 36. Pardo, L. H. *et al.* Effects of nitrogen deposition and empirical nitrogen critical loads for
408 ecoregions of the United States. *Ecol. Appl.* **21**, 3049–3082 (2011).
- 409 37. Hettelingh, J.-P. *et al.* Effects-based integrated assessment modelling for the support of
410 European air pollution abatement policies. in *Critical loads and dynamic risk*
411 *assessments: nitrogen, acidity and metals in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems* (eds. de
412 Vries, W., Hettelingh, J.-P. & Posch, M.) 613–635 (Springer Netherlands, 2015).
413 doi:10.1007/978-94-017-9508-1_25.
- 414 38. Reis, S. *et al.* From acid rain to climate change. *Science* **338**, 1153–1154 (2012).
- 415 39. Lilleskov, E. A., Hobbie, E. A. & Horton, T. R. Conservation of ectomycorrhizal fungi:
416 exploring the linkages between functional and taxonomic responses to anthropogenic N
417 deposition. *Fun. Ecol.* **4**, 174–183 (2011).

- 418 40. Hendershot, J. N., Read, Q. D., Henning, J. A., Sanders, N. J. & Classen, A. T.
419 Consistently inconsistent drivers of microbial diversity and abundance at macroecological
420 scales. *Ecology* **98**, 1757–1763 (2017).
- 421 41. Thompson, L. R. *et al.* A communal catalogue reveals Earth’s multiscale microbial
422 diversity. *Nature* **551**, 457 (2017).
- 423 42. Glassman S. I. *et al.* A continental view of pine-associated ectomycorrhizal fungal spore
424 banks: a quiescent functional guild with a strong biogeographic pattern. *New Phytol.* **205**,
425 1619–1631 (2015).
- 426 43. Gardes, M. & Bruns, T. D. Community structure of ectomycorrhizal fungi in a *Pinus*
427 *muricata* forest: above- and below-ground views. *Can. J. Bot.* **74**, 1572–1583 (1996).
- 428 44. Anderson, I. C. & Cairney, J. W. G. Ectomycorrhizal fungi: exploring the mycelial
429 frontier. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **31**, 388–406 (2007)
- 430 45. Buée M., Sentausa E., Murat C. Molecular technologies applied to the ecology of
431 ectomycorrhizal communities. in *Molecular Mycorrhizal Symbiosis* (ed. Martin F.) 323–
432 406 (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2016). DOI: 10.1002/9781118951446.ch18.
- 433 46. Tedersoo, L. & Nilsson, R. H. Molecular identification of fungi. in *Molecular*
434 *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis* (ed. Martin F.) 299–322 (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2016).
435 DOI:10.1002/9781118951446.ch17.
- 436 47. Newton, A. C. & Haigh, J. M. Diversity of ectomycorrhizal fungi in Britain: a test of the
437 species–area relationship, and the role of host specificity. *New Phytol.* **138**, 619–627
438 (1998).
- 439 48. Peay, K. G. The mutualistic niche: mycorrhizal symbiosis and community dynamics.
440 *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **47**, 143–164 (2016).

- 441 49. Taylor, A. F. S., Fransson, P. M., Högborg, P., Högborg, M. N. & Plamboeck, A. H.
 442 Species level patterns in ^{13}C and ^{15}N abundance of ectomycorrhizal and saprotrophic
 443 fungal sporocarps. *New Phytol.* **159**, 757–774 (2003).
- 444 50. Hortal, S. *et al.* Role of plant–fungal nutrient trading and host control in determining the
 445 competitive success of ectomycorrhizal fungi. *ISME J.* **11**, 2666 (2017).
- 446 51. Lilleskov, E. A., Hobbie, E. A. & Horton, T. R. Conservation of ectomycorrhizal fungi:
 447 exploring the linkages between functional and taxonomic responses to anthropogenic N
 448 deposition. *Fun. Ecol.* **4**, 174–183 (2011).
- 449 52. Tripler C. E., Kaushal S. S., Likens G. E., Walter M. T. Patterns of potassium dynamics
 450 in forest ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* **9**, 451–466 (2006).
- 451 53. Agerer, R. Exploration types of ectomycorrhizae. *Mycorrhiza* **11**, 107–114 (2001).
- 452 54. Boddy, L. *et al.* Climate variation effects on fungal fruiting. *Fun. Ecol.* **10**, 20–33 (2014).
- 453 55. Wallander, H. A new hypothesis to explain allocation of dry matter between mycorrhizal
 454 fungi and pine seedlings in relation to nutrient supply. *Plant Soil* **168**, 243–248 (1995).
- 455 56. Van Strien, A. J., Boomsluiters, M., Noordeloos, M. E., Verweij, R. J. T. & Kuyper, T. W.
 456 Woodland ectomycorrhizal fungi benefit from large-scale reduction in nitrogen
 457 deposition in the Netherlands. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **55**, 290–298 (2018).
- 458 57. Arnolds, E. Decline of ectomycorrhizal fungi in Europe. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **35**,
 459 209–244 (1991).
- 460 58. Lilleskov, E.A. How do composition, structure, and function of mycorrhizal fungal
 461 communities respond to nitrogen deposition and ozone exposure? in *The Fungal*
 462 *Community* (eds. Dighton, J. White, J.) 769–801 (CRC Press., 2005).
- 463 59. Kiers, E. T., Palmer, T. M., Ives, A. R., Bruno, J. F. & Bronstein, J. L. Mutualisms in a
 464 changing world: an evolutionary perspective. *Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 1459–1474 (2010).

60. Bobbink, R. & Hettelingh, J. P. Effects of nitrogen deposition on woodland, forest and other wooded land (EUNIS class G). in *Review and Revision of Empirical Critical Loads and Dose-Response Relationships*. RIVM Report 680359002, pp. 135–171 (2017).
61. Giordani, P. *et al.* Detecting the nitrogen critical loads on European forests by means of epiphytic lichens. A signal-to-noise evaluation. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **311**, 29–40 (2014).
62. Leppänen, S. M., Salemaa, M., Smolander, A., Mäkipää, R. & Tirola, M. Nitrogen fixation and methanotrophy in forest mosses along a N deposition gradient. *Env. Exp. Bot.* **90**, 62–69 (2013).
63. Güsewell, S. N : P ratios in terrestrial plants: variation and functional significance. *New Phytol.* **164**, 243–266 (2004).
64. Cools, N. & De Vos, B. Availability and evaluation of European forest soil monitoring data in the study on the effects of air pollution on forests. *iForest* **4**, 205–211 (2011).
65. Hazard, C. & Johnson, D. Does genotypic and species diversity of mycorrhizal plants and fungi affect ecosystem function? *New Phytol.* (2018) DOI: 10.1111/nph.15010.
66. Chen, W. *et al.* Root morphology and mycorrhizal symbioses together shape nutrient foraging strategies of temperate trees. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 8741–8746 (2016).

Supplementary Information is available in the online version of the paper.

Acknowledgements NERC grant NE/K006339/1 to M.B. and D.O. Analysis partly based on ICPF PCC Database (<http://icp-forests.net>). ICPF FSCC provided first Level II soil survey data. ICPF PCC and observers, technicians and scientists performed long-term sampling, analyses and environmental data handling largely funded by national institutions and ministries, supported by governmental bodies, services and landowners, and partially EU-funded under Regulation (EC) No.2152/2003 (Forest Focus), project LIFE07ENV/D/000218

(FutMon), and through SWETHRO. Co-financing for D.Ž. and T.G. by P4-0107 (RS Higher Education, Science and Technology Ministry). D. Devey and L. Csiba for laboratory assistance, S. Boersma, F., H. and J. van der Linde, C. Gonzales, A. and R. Lenz, S. Wipf, L. Garfoot, B. Spake, W. Rimington, J. Kowal, T. Solovieva, D. Gane, M. Terrington, J. Alden, A. Otway, V. Kemp, M. Edgar, Y. Lin, A. Drew, E. Booth, P. Cachera, R. De-Kayne, J. Downie, A. Tweedy, E. Moratto, E. Ek, P. Helminen, R. Lievonen, P. Närhi, A. Ryyänen, M. Rupel, J. Draing and F. Heun for field and laboratory work, R. Castilho for bioinformatics, K.-H. Larsson, P.-A. Moreau, J. Nuytinck and M. Ryberg for taxonomy, N. Barsoum, E. Lilleskov, D. Read and T. Kuyper for discussions throughout.

Author contributions M.B. conceived study. S.V., M.B., F.C., L.S., B.A. led most sampling design and fieldwork. S.V., B.A., L.S., F.C., Y.Z., M.B. processed and analysed samples. H.A., E.A., S.B., N.C., B.D., H.D., J.E., J.G., T.G., K.H., F.J., F.K., P.L., M.M., J.M., H.M., P.M., M.N., P.P., P.R., M.S., H.S., W.S., V.Š., A.T., I.T., H.T., E.V., A.V., L.V., P.W., S.W., D.Ž. assisted fieldwork and collected, collated and validated long-term environmental data. S.V., H.G., D.O. performed bioinformatics. S.V., D.O., L.S. performed data analysis. C.C. summarized literature. S.V. drafted manuscript, M.B. provided chief contributions, D.O., L.S. contributed extensively. All authors wrote and reviewed manuscript. S.V., L.S., D.O., M.B. led revision.

Author information Reprints and permissions information available at www.nature.com/reprints. R code available upon reasonable request. Sequencing data available through DRYAD under doi:10.5061/dryad.cr70qc8. Environmental data available from ICPF but restrictions apply. Data available from authors upon reasonable request with

ICPF permission. Authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and material requests to S.V. (sietse.vanderlinde@forestry.gsi.gov.uk).

Figure legends

Figure 1: Map of Europe showing sampled UNECE ICP Forests Level II plots.

Polygons depict outer boundaries of the sampled area for each host tree species.

Figure 2: Krona chart of taxonomic affiliation of ectomycorrhizas and their relative

abundance. Inner circles represent higher taxonomic ranks, while more detailed taxonomic ranks (up to species level) are presented in outer circles. A full interactive version of this chart is available in the online version of this article (Supplementary Information Fig. 1).

Figure 3: Variation partitioning Venn diagram showing the percentages of individual

contributions of host variables (host species, foliar chemistry and defoliation), soil+deposition variables, climatic variables and geographic distance. Percentage of variance explained by multiple partition models is shown where ellipses overlap. Values in brackets show the total percentage of variance explained by the four partitions. Residual variance represents the percentage unexplained by the four partition models.

Figure 4: Threshold indicator taxa analyses (TITAN) on individual OTU abundances in

response to N_{TFD} (a). Black symbols show taxa declining with increasing N_{TFD} (z^-), open symbols depict increasing taxa (z^+). Symbol size is proportional to magnitude of response (z -score). Horizontal lines represent 5th and 95th quantiles of values resulting in the largest change in taxon z -scores among 1,000 bootstrap replicates. Tree shapes indicate host

generalist, conifer- or broadleaf-specific. Community-level output of accumulated z-scores per plot is shown in response to N_{TFD} (b).

Materials and methods

Sampling and processing

Since 1995, the International Co-operative Programme on Assessment and Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Forests^{67,68} has been intensively monitoring ca. 800 plots (Level II) in major forest ecosystems across Europe⁶⁹. Their extensive *in situ* data better reflect the local environmental conditions of plots than regional modelled or extrapolated data⁷⁰. These Level II plots of at least 0.25 ha and located within homogenous forest stands are structurally diverse and cover a representative mixture of European managed forest types (ranging from plantations to natural regenerating forests)⁷¹. European forests are dominated by Scots pine, Norway spruce and European beech (60% of EU30 forest area), with the next three most common tree species together covering 10%. We selected all ICP Forests Level II plots where deposition, meteorology, foliar chemistry, soil and preferably soil solution data are measured simultaneously, and between September 2013 and September 2015 we sampled plots with European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.; n = 35), Norway spruce (*Picea abies* (L.) H. Karst; n = 36) or Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.; n = 32) as the dominant (>50% abundance) tree species. We combined these with additional data similarly collected from Scots pine Level II plots by Cox et al.¹⁸ (n = 12) and pedunculate and sessile oak (*Quercus robur* L. and *Q. petraea* (Matt.) Liebl) by Suz et al.¹⁶ (n = 22), to give a widespread coverage of European forest areas (Fig. 1).

We used Sanger DNA sequencing of the full internal transcribed spacer (ITS) amplicon from individual ectomycorrhizas to maximise resolution of identifications, obtain relative abundance data and link DNA sequences directly to morphology, following the standardized

sampling protocols of Cox et al.¹⁸ and Suz et al.¹⁶. Briefly, on each plot (n = 137) 24 trees of the investigated target tree species were randomly selected and from those trees a transect was made to the nearest tree of the target species, then four soil samples (25 cm deep, 2 cm diameter) were collected at equal distances on each transect. When plots contained multiple tree species, areas with non-target tree species were avoided. Soil samples were stored at 4°C up to ten days until processed. Roots from each soil core were rinsed on a 0.5 mm sieve, and mycorrhizal roots were collected for five minutes using a dissecting microscope. Subsequently, from each soil sample, an individual mycorrhiza was sampled from the three longest roots, resulting in 288 mycorrhizas per plot. Morphological characteristics of each mycorrhiza were recorded, including presence/absence of emanating hyphae and rhizomorphs, and turgor to assess activity. Genomic DNA from individual mycorrhizas was obtained using Extract-N-Amp (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA), and the ITS region of the nuclear rDNA was amplified using ITS1F⁷² and ITS4⁷³ primers. Amplicons were purified using ExoSAP-IT (USB, Cleveland, OH, USA) and sequenced bidirectionally using BigDye3.1 with an ABI 3730 DNA Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA).

Environmental data

On the Level II plots various environmental long-term measurements (average 14 years) were carried out using national protocols based on a harmonized methodology⁷⁴ (see Supplementary Information Table 2). Soil types were classified in ten types: Andosols, Arenosols, Calcisols, Cambisols, Leptosols, Podzols, Regosols, Umbrisols, soil types characterised by an Argic B horizon (i.e. Luvisols and Alisols), and soils with gleyic properties (i.e. Gleysols and Stagnosols)^{64,75}. Whilst maximizing the number of plots without missing values (n = 108), we selected available data including forest age, level of defoliation⁷⁶, geographical coordinates and elevation along with soil (eight variables) and

foliar (seven variables of investigated tree species)⁷⁷ data, atmospheric throughfall deposition chemistry (wet and dry under forest canopy deposition, 11 variables)⁷⁸ and meteorology (six variables)⁷⁹.

Bioinformatics

We used Phred⁸⁰ to obtain base quality scores (Q) for both forward and reverse DNA sequences from all individual mycorrhizas, including DNA sequences from Cox et al.¹⁸ and Suz et al.¹⁶. The two sequences obtained from each mycorrhiza were assembled in Geneious (version 8.1.8)⁸¹, with the De Novo Assemble tool. We used Trimmomatic⁸² to remove low quality bases (Q < 20) at either end of the sequences and then discarded short reads (< 100 remaining bp). We then used the uchime_ref tool in vsearch⁸³ to match chimeric sequences against the UNITE reference database (version 7.1, 22/08/2016).

We used the usearch_global tool in vsearch to identify remaining DNA sequences with a percentage match $\geq 97\%$ to UNITE 7.1 species hypotheses⁸⁴. From the remaining unmatched sequences, we first removed all sequences with ambiguous base pair codes and then used the cluster_fast tool in vsearch, to identify *de novo* operational taxonomic unit (OTU) clusters.

The unmatched sequences were then matched to the centroids of these *de novo* clusters; sequences were accepted with a percentage identity $\geq 97\%$ and the remainder discarded.

We used three sources of information for each *de novo* centroid to confirm the identification of the fungal sequences and to provide tentative classifications. First, we examined the ten best alignments from BLAST searches⁸⁵ of the Genbank nucleotide database. Second, we trained RDP Classifier⁸⁶ against the UNITE 7.1 database and then classified the *de novo* centroids against the trained database. Third, we used vsearch to obtain the best match of each centroid to the UNITE 7.1 species hypotheses.

Finally, we checked the EM status of all OTUs by comparing the taxonomic classification based on UNITE with the literature^{87,88}. When OTUs assigned in UNITE to species hypothesis were identified to a taxonomic level that includes both EM and non-EM fungi (e.g. Agaricomycetes sp.), we retrieved the taxonomic names associated with all UNITE DNA sequences within that species hypothesis to assess the level of uncertainty in the classification of the species hypothesis. We discarded *de novo* OTUs with less resolved classification: (a) whose classification was distant from known EM fungi, (b) where the root tip morphology suggested possibly dead plant or fungal tissue, and (c) which were based on relatively short sequences (<150 bp). The set of identified EM fungal sequences was then used to construct an abundance matrix of OTUs across sites. We used the Hellinger transformation of proportion abundance⁸⁹ in subsequent analyses. Host specificity of abundant OTUs (≥ 50 EM) was established by scoring occurrence at plots with the different tree hosts. The OTUs occurring with one host tree species in a plot were considered strictly specific and OTUs occurring with both coniferous and broadleaf or with more than two tree species were considered generalists.

Statistical analysis

We used R (version 3.3.3) for statistical analyses and generating figures⁹⁰. To quantify the importance of host variables, soil and deposition chemistry, climate and geographic distance on EM fungal community composition, variances were partitioned following Borcard et al.⁹¹ and Legendre & Legendre⁹². Explanatory variables describing plot and tree characteristics were grouped in the following partitions: (i) host (host species, foliar chemistry and defoliation), (ii) soil and deposition chemistry (soil characteristics and throughfall deposition), (iii) climate (climatic region, mean annual air temperature (MAT), precipitation, growing season length, minimum and maximum annual temperatures,

637 elevation) and (iv) geographic distance (excluding elevation). The most relevant variables in
 638 each partition were found through forward-selection model-building with the redundancy
 639 analysis (RDA) method based on AIC and $P < 0.05$ using ordistep in the vegan package⁹³.
 640 Geographic distances are the great circle distances, calculated using the mean Earth radius
 641 between the minimum and maximum latitude of plots in this study ($r = 6,365$ km) with
 642 rdist.earth in the fields package⁹⁴. Great circle distances are commonly used in large scale
 643 macroecological studies to approach real distances between sampling sites^{95,96}. The
 644 geographic distance matrix was transformed to rectangular data by extracting spatial vectors
 645 with principal coordinates of neighbour matrices (PCNM) using pcnm (vegan). To build the
 646 geographic distance model, PCNM vectors accounting for autocorrelation were extracted (P
 647 < 0.05) using MoranI (lctools package)⁹⁷ and forward selected. Variation partitioning was
 648 carried out for the 108 plots with the selected environmental data using varpart (vegan).
 649 Global non-metric multi-dimensional scaling (NMDS) ordinations were used to explore and
 650 visualise the main factors affecting EM fungal community composition with metaMDS
 651 (vegan). Environmental variables (Supplementary Information Table 2) were fitted to the
 652 ordination plots using envfit (vegan). Ordinations were performed for the 108 plots with the
 653 selected environmental data. In order to limit co-linearity effects between variables, we
 654 selected key environmental variables from the envfit results with $R^2 > 0.4$ and $P < 0.01$. In
 655 case of correlations ($r \geq 0.7$) between those variables, the most commonly measured
 656 environmental variable (Supplementary Information Table 1) was selected: N throughfall
 657 deposition (N_{TFD}), forest floor pH, MAT, K throughfall deposition (K_{TFD}) and foliar N:P ratio
 658 ($N:P_F$).
 659 Indicator species for the key environmental variables were detected and their threshold values
 660 were calculated using threshold indicator species analyses (TITAN2)⁹⁸. The sums of the
 661 indicator species scores of all OTUs were used to detect lower and upper EM community

thresholds for key environmental variables. In addition to N_{TFD} we also obtained EM community thresholds for N open field deposition since open field deposition measurements better reflect the data that is available in spatially mapped deposition datasets^{99,100}. G-tests were performed to test if host species or soil type influence hyphal and rhizomorph presence or absence. We used logistic regression with each key environmental variable and the presence or absence of emanating hyphae and rhizomorphs within individual OTUs to test for environmental influences on their morphological plasticity. We considered OTUs where the indicator analysis suggested a response to a particular environmental variable and, for statistical power, we only tested OTUs with $\geq 15\%$ presence and $\geq 15\%$ absence of emanating hyphae or rhizomorphs (Extended Data Table 1). Target tree species and soil type was used as co-variate, to account for potential variation in hyphal and rhizomorph development in mycorrhizas belonging to the same OTU among different tree species and different soil types.

Code availability, R scripts for data analyses are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Data availability, Sequencing data generated during the current study are available through DRYAD under doi:10.5061/dryad.cr70qc8. Morphological characteristic and host specificity data generated during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. All environmental data (including deposition, foliar chemistry, soil and meteorological data) are available from UNECE ICP Forests but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study. Data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and with permission of UNECE ICP Forests.

- 686 67. UNECE International Co-operative Programme on Assessment and Monitoring of Air
687 Pollution Effects on Forests. URL <http://icp-forests.net/>
- 688 68. Ferretti, M. & Fischer, R. Methods for terrestrial investigations in Europe with an
689 overview of North America and Asia. *Forest Monitoring*, Vol. 12, 1st edn. Elsevier,
690 Amsterdam (2013).
- 691 69. De Vries, W., *et al.* Intensive monitoring of forest ecosystems in Europe – 1. Objectives,
692 set-up and evaluation strategy. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **174**, 77–95 (2003).
- 693 70. Dirnböck, T. *et al.* Forest floor vegetation response to nitrogen deposition in Europe.
694 *Glob. Change Biol.* **20**, 429–440 (2014).
- 695 71. Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (2007).
- 696 72. Gardes, M. & Bruns, T. D. ITS primers with enhanced specificity for basidiomycetes -
697 application to the identification of mycorrhizae and rusts. *Mol. Ecol.* **2**, 113–118 (1993).
- 698 73. White, T. J., Bruns, T., Lee, S. & Taylor, J. Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal
699 ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. in *PCR Protocols: a guide to methods and*
700 *applications* (eds. Innis, M. A., Gelfand, D. H., Sninsky, J. J. & White, T. J.) 315–322
701 (Academic Press, New York, 1990).
- 702 74. UNECE ICP Forests Programme Co-ordinating Centre: Manual on methods and criteria
703 for harmonized sampling, assessment, monitoring and analysis of the effects of air
704 pollution on forests. Thünen Institute for Forest Ecosystems, Eberswalde, (2016) URL
705 <http://icp-forests.org/Manual.htm>
- 706 75. IUSS Working Group WRB. 2015. World reference base for soil resources 2014, update
707 2015. International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for
708 soil maps. World Soil Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome (2015).
- 709 76. Eichhorn, J., *et al.* Visual assessment of crown condition and damaging agents. In,
710 Manual on methods and criteria for harmonized sampling, assessment, monitoring and

711 analysis of the effects of air pollution on forests, UNECE ICP Forests Programme Co-
712 ordinating Centre, Eberswalde, p. 54 (2016).

713 77. Rautio, P., Fürst, A., Stefan, K. & Bartels, U. Sampling and analyses of needles and
714 leaves. In, Manual on methods and criteria for harmonized sampling, assessment,
715 monitoring and analysis of the effects of air pollution on forests. UNECE ICP Forests
716 Programme Co-ordinating Centre, Eberswalde, p. 19 (2016).

717 78. Waldner *et al.* Detection of temporal trends in atmospheric deposition of inorganic
718 nitrogen and sulphate to forests in *Europe. Atmos. Environ.* **95**, 363–374 (2014).

719 79. Raspe, S., Beuker, E., Preuhsler, T. & Bastrup-Birk, A., Meteorological measurements.
720 In, Manual on methods and criteria for harmonized sampling, assessment, monitoring and
721 analysis of the effects of air pollution on forests. UNECE ICP Forests Programme Co-
722 ordinating Centre, Eberswalde, p. 35 (2016).

723 80. Ewing, B. & Green, P. Basecalling of automated sequencer traces using *phred*. II. Error
724 probabilities. *Genome Res.* **8**, 186–194 (1998).

725 81. Kears, M. *et al.* Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software platform
726 for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 1647–1649 (2012)

727 82. Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. & Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
728 sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).

729 83. Rognes, T., Flouri, T., Nichols, B., Quince, C. & Mahé F. VSEARCH: a versatile open
730 source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ Preprints* **4**, e2409v1 (2016).

731 84. Kõljalg *et al.* Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi.
732 *Mol. Ecol.* **22**, 5271–5277 (2013).

733 85. Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W. & Lipman, D. J. Basic local alignment
734 search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* **215**, 403–410 (1990).

- 735 86. Wang, Q., Garrity, G. M., Tiedje, J. M. & Cole, J. R. Naïve Bayesian classifier for rapid
736 assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl. Environ.*
737 *Microbiol.* **73**, 5261–7 (2007).
- 738 87. Rinaldi, A. C., Comandini, O. & Kuyper, T. W. Ectomycorrhizal fungal diversity:
739 separating the wheat from the chaff. *Fungal Div.* **33**, 1560–2745 (2008).
- 740 88. Tedersoo, L., May, T. W. & Smith, M. E. Ectomycorrhizal lifestyle in fungi: global
741 diversity, distribution, and evolution of phylogenetic lineages. *Mycorrhiza* **20**, 217–263
742 (2010).
- 743 89. Legendre, P. & Gallagher, E. D. Ecologically meaningful transformations for ordination
744 of species data. *Oecologia* **129**, 271–280 (2001).
- 745 90. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
746 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria <http://www.R-project.org/> (2016).
- 747 91. Borcard, D., Legendre, P. & Drapeau, P. Partialling out the spatial component of
748 ecological variation. *Ecology* **73**, 1045–1055 (1992).
- 749 92. Legendre, P. & Legendre, L. *Numerical Ecology*, 2nd edn. Springer, Amsterdam (1998).
- 750 93. Blanchet, F. G., Legendre, P. & Borcard, D. Forward selection of explanatory variables.
751 *Ecology* **89**, 2623–2632 (2008).
- 752 94. Fields Development Team. fields: Tools for Spatial Data. National Center for
753 Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO. <http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/Software/Fields> (2006).
- 754 95. Lee et al. On the post-glacial spread of human commensal *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature*
755 *Comm.* DOI:10.1038/ncomms14458 (2017).
- 756 96. Lamb et al. Climate-driven mitochondrial selection: a test in Australian songbirds, *Mol.*
757 *Ecol.* DOI: 10.1111/mec.14488 (2018).
- 758 97. Kalogirou, S. lctools: Local correlation, spatial inequalities, geographically weighted
759 regression and other tools <http://lctools.science/> (2016).

98. Baker, M. E. & King, R. S. A new method for detecting and interpreting biodiversity and ecological community thresholds. *Meths. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 25–37 (2010).
99. Dore, A. J. *et al.* Evaluation of the performance of different atmospheric chemical transport models and inter-comparison of nitrogen and sulphur deposition estimates for the UK. *Atmospheric Environ.* **119**, 131–143 (2015).
100. Dirnböck, T. *et al.* Forest floor vegetation response to nitrogen deposition in Europe. *Glob. Change Biol.* **20**, 429–440 (2014).

Extended table titles and legends

Extended Data Table 1. Envfit results for the environmental variables used in the NMDS ordination. Significant variables are printed bold.

Extended Data Table 2: Observed and expected frequencies of hyphae and rhizomorph presence for host tree species (a) and soil type (b). S1 = Fe Al soils, S2 = Clay soils, S3 = Soils with little or no differentiation, S4 = Salt accumulation soils, S5 = Organic accumulation soils, S6 = Limited root soil.

Extended Data Table 3: Effects of key variables on hyphal plasticity for 97% sequence similarity OTUs (a) and 99% sequence similarity OTUs (b). *P* values < 0.05 are printed bold. Logistic regressions were only calculated for OTUs where the indicator analysis suggested a response to a particular environmental variable. With: ⁻ = declining indicator (z-), ⁺ = increasing indicator (z+), ↓ = negative correlation, ↑ = positive correlation.

Extended Data Table 4: Effects of key variables on rhizomorph plasticity for 97% sequence similarity OTUs (a) and 99% sequence similarity OTUs (b). *P* values < 0.05 are

printed bold. Logistic regressions were only calculated for OTUs where the indicator analysis suggested a response to a particular environmental variable. With: $\bar{\cdot}$ = declining indicator (z-), $\bar{+}$ = increasing indicator (z+), \downarrow = negative correlation, \uparrow = positive correlation.

Extended Data Table 5: Effects of key variables on hyphal and rhizomorph presence on the total EM community. *P* values < 0.05 are printed bold. With: \downarrow = negative correlation, \uparrow = positive correlation.

Extended data figures

Extended Data Figure 1: Global non-metric multidimensional scaling ordination of community composition showing plots with host trees (brown squares: beech; blue circles: oak; green triangles: pine; yellow diamonds: spruce). Isoclines depict the forest floor pH and arrows show the direction and strength of correlation of the most influential environmental variables according to their R^2 values (> 0.4). A = MAT; B = mean minimum annual air temperature; C = growing season length; D = NH_4 throughfall deposition; E = N_{TFD} .

Extended Data Figure 2: Threshold indicator taxa analyses (TITAN) on individual OTU abundances in response to $\text{N}:\text{P}_\text{F}$ (a), forest floor pH (c), K_{TFD} (e) and MAT (g). Black symbols correspond to taxa declining with the increasing variable (z-), open symbols depict increasing taxa (z+). Symbol size is proportional to magnitude of response (z-score). Horizontal lines represent 5th and 95th quantiles of values resulting in the largest change in taxon z-scores among 1,000 bootstrap replicates. Tree shapes indicate host generalist, conifer- or broadleaf-specific. Community-level output of accumulated z-scores per plot is shown in response to $\text{N}:\text{P}_\text{F}$ (b), forest floor pH (d), K_{TFD} (f) and MAT (h).

810 **Extended Data Figure 3: Threshold indicator taxa analysis at the genus level** in response
811 to N_{TFD} (a), $N:P_F$ (c), forest floor pH (e), K_{TFD} (g) and MAT (i). Black symbols correspond to
812 taxa that declined with the increasing variable (z^-), open symbols depict increasing taxa (z^+).
813 Symbol size is proportional to magnitude of response (z-score). Horizontal lines represent 5th
814 and 95th quantiles of values resulting in the largest change in taxon z-scores among 1,000
815 bootstrap replicates. The community-level output of the accumulated z-scores per plot is
816 shown in response to N_{TFD} (b), $N:P_F$ (d), forest floor pH (f), K_{TFD} (h) and MAT (j).