



**HAL**  
open science

## Role of substrate properties in the provision of multifunctional green roof ecosystem services

J.-C. Lata, Y. Dusza, Luc Abbadie, S. Barot, D. Carmignac, E. Gendreau, Y. Kraepiel, J. Mériguet, E. Motard, X. Raynaud

### ► To cite this version:

J.-C. Lata, Y. Dusza, Luc Abbadie, S. Barot, D. Carmignac, et al.. Role of substrate properties in the provision of multifunctional green roof ecosystem services. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 2018, 123, pp.464-468. 10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.09.012 . hal-01685372

**HAL Id: hal-01685372**

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01685372v1>

Submitted on 16 Jan 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



31 points of modern architecture", published in 1927 by Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret. However, the 1950s and  
32 the associate quick succession of urban plans marked a halt to the investment of roofs by vegetation. The current  
33 concept of green roof only emerged during the 1970s and 1980s. These years were characterized by the  
34 emergence of environmental concerns at an international level. Reports such as "The limits to growth" (1972,  
35 commissioned by the Club of Rome), or "Our common future" (1987, Brundtland report of the World  
36 Commission on Environment and Development) have led to the notion of sustainable development. In this  
37 context, Germany decided to launch an active policy for the development of environmental technologies and  
38 public policies (Oberndorfer et al., 2007), which has favoured the emergence of modern green roofs. This has led  
39 to the adoption by Germany in 1982 of its first professional rules for green roofing (FLL, 2010).

40

## 41 **2. What constraints on and caused by green roof substrates?**

42 Vegetated roofs are intended to reintroduce a living component in cities while integrating building structural  
43 constraints. Two of these constraints have guided the development of roofing vegetation technologies. The first  
44 concerns the need to maintain roof water-tightness despite the presence of roots. Above all, the fundamental role  
45 of a roof is the protection it offers to people and objects. The problem has been solved by the development of  
46 anti-root membranes associated with conventional roof protections (bituminous layers in particular). The second  
47 constraint is that of weight. At a time when the precision of architectural techniques makes it possible to  
48 precisely calculate the loads supported floor by floor, little margin is provided for roofs except for the snow load  
49 or other technical elements. In the 1970s, while some companies had already developed suitable membranes and  
50 lightweight substrates, several German studies have shown that green roofs are likely to bring environmental  
51 benefits. This includes limiting rainfall run-off to storm sewer pipes, but also thermal protection of buildings  
52 (Dunnett and Kingsburry, 2008).

53 Because the issues of roof overload and water-tightness are so crucial to the integrity of buildings, but also to  
54 the comfort and safety of people who live or work there, the vegetation market for roofs has been structured  
55 around these constraints. The substrates are not only light but also have to be shallow, leading to the existence of  
56 green roofs whose thickness in some case may not exceed 2 cm. However by doing this, this also creates a new  
57 constraint in the limited choice of plants species that must be suitable for both shallow substrates and drought  
58 conditions. These conditions of restricted root development and poor water reserve, associated with significant  
59 sun exposures and potentially high windiness (Cao et al., 2013), create unfavourable growing conditions for  
60 many plant species. Species of the genus *Sedum*, from the family Crassulaceae, in other words succulent plants,

61 respond to these expectations: they have restricted root system, their metabolism limit water loss through  
62 transpiration (Ting, 1985) and they can store water in their succulent leaves (Sayed, 2001). However, these  
63 *Sedum* species are not exempt from high mortality rates (Durhman et al., 2007) and the counterpart of the  
64 success of *Sedum* / artificial substrate association is that it constitutes the vast majority of green roofs in the  
65 world, leading to poor plant diversity, but also to limited plant and substrate functional diversity.

66

### 67 **3. What is a green roof substrate?**

68 As the greening of roofs is closely associated with the waterproofing and roofing sectors, the term "layers"  
69 refers to the different components of green roofs (Berardi et al., 2014). In fact, several technical layers are  
70 necessary before any revegetation (Vijayaraghavan, 2016). Green roof will consist of at least waterproofing and  
71 anti-root membranes, to which, according to the manufacturers, may be added various layers of insulation,  
72 drainage or water retention. Finally, the terms growth layer and vegetation layer are regularly used, both in the  
73 technical and scientific literature, to evoke the soil or substrate and the vegetation used. The composition of the  
74 growth layer (or growth substrate) reflects the search for lightness and is characterized by the artificial mixing of  
75 mineral and organic compounds (Sutton et al., 2015). There are two types of mineral elements. These are  
76 primarily volcanic rocks, such as pumice or pozzolan, or artificial elements, such as expanded clay or expanded  
77 shale. Some substrates also mix these different elements. All these natural or artificial materials have the  
78 particularity of being highly porous, and therefore light (Massazza, 1998), although in varying degrees. While  
79 porosity of perlite is generally close to 30% of its total volume (Vijayaraghavan and Raja, 2014), artificial  
80 materials such as expanded clay can exceed 80% (Berretta et al., 2014). The organic part of the substrates aims  
81 to provide the nutrients needed for plant development (including through the promotion of soil biodiversity and  
82 its associated functions) and is usually peat (Nardini et al., 2011) or compost from recycled organic waste. The  
83 use of high organic matter substrates (or even of natural soils) is however subject to controversies (Best et al.,  
84 2015). On the one hand, their use enhances the soil micro- and macro-diversity, and nutrient cycling and  
85 retention. On the other hand, there are concerns about increased roof loading and fine particle illuviation, and to  
86 unpredictable biological activities (in or above the substrate). These last concerns have led so far industry  
87 professionals to strongly discourage the use of high organic matter substrates or natural soils, in particular for  
88 maintenance reasons (e.g. removal of opportunistic ruderals plant species).

89 Depending on the country of origin (e.g. French, German or American policies), the proposed proportions of  
90 mineral matter is ca. 70-95%, and thus ca. 5 to 30% of organic matter. The high proportion of mineral material

91 has two explanations. On the one hand, organic matter is generally denser than mineral portions. Chambers et al.  
92 (2010) estimated that peat density can reach 2000 kg.m<sup>-3</sup>, when that of expanded clay usually don't exceed 700  
93 kg.m<sup>-3</sup> (Ardakani and Yazdani, 2014). The other explanation is that a too rich substrate would lead to a rapid  
94 leaching of nutrients, which would be a source of carbon and nitrogen pollution for runoff water (Rowe et al.,  
95 2006). For the same reasons, rapidly decomposing peat is particularly deprecated (Nagase and Dunnett, 2011).

96 The massive incorporation of porous materials into the substrates has the effect of reducing their density, in  
97 ranges of ca. 0.6-1 t.m<sup>-3</sup> when dry and 0.8-1.6 t.m<sup>-3</sup> when water-saturated. While these substrates have long been  
98 the only ones available on the market, the present trend is for diversification. While soils are explicitly excluded  
99 from the occupational rules for most systems, recycled materials such as crushed bricks or tiles develop  
100 gradually (Ondoño et al., 2015), with the advantage of being both local and potentially mild materials (Graceson  
101 et al., 2014). Moreover, the need for more functional diversity led to the definition of different green roof  
102 typologies based mainly on their depth, the substrate type used for the growth layer, and therefore the induced  
103 load for the building, but also on the type of vegetation and the degree of maintenance required. These different  
104 systems are called: extensive (light substrate, no watering, thickness of substrate of 4-15 cm, mainly succulent  
105 plants); semi-intensive (light substrate, watering, thickness of substrate of 12-30 cm, grasses or low-development  
106 shrubs); and intensive (natural soil, watering, thickness of substrate < 30 cm, unlimited choice of plants). While  
107 the majority of the systems sold are extensive, there is a growing rejection of the "all *Sedum*" (*i.e.* very shallow  
108 extensive roof, only planted with *Sedum* species) and an increased demand for systems with a greater variety of  
109 species, pushing towards the development of "semi-intensive" offers. This evolution, which is still difficult to  
110 quantify, echoes the increasing number of environmental approaches taken by local and regional authorities (e.g.  
111 in France) to increase the diversity of plant species and the depth of substrate on the roofs, in a context where  
112 75% orders are public organisms (CSTB 2008).

113

#### 114 **4. What ecosystem services are provided by green roof substrates?**

115 The reasons for the growing popularity of green roofs are the same as those that prevailed when they were  
116 (re)created in the 1980s: the multiplicity of environmental services they provide, highlighted both in terms of  
117 supply and demand (Dusza et al., 2015). Because green roofs are a combination of abiotic and biotic components  
118 interacting with their environment, and because these benefits are "services people obtain from ecosystems" in  
119 the sense of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005), green roofs provide numerous ecosystem services  
120 (Table 1) including important cultural services (Lee et al., 2015).

121 The ecosystem services associated with green roofs are widely put forward, both at the level of prime  
122 contractors and owners, and explain to a large extent their popularity worldwide. Green roofs are subject to very  
123 wide disciplinary appropriations but are often relatively remote from the biology or ecology fields. The  
124 discipline fields most represented are that of energy and physics, followed by hydrology (Blank et al., 2013). *De*  
125 *facto* this diversity of disciplinary fields reflects the diversity of services that can be provided by green roofs.  
126 The great majority of publications, however, rely on a similar initial objective, namely to determine the  
127 effectiveness of green roofs in relation to the ecosystem service studied.

128 In the realization of these services, and the trade-offs between services and disservices, the role of substrate is  
129 decisive, and in particular for two of its characteristics: substrate composition and substrate depth. First,  
130 substrate composition affect substrate fertility and the availability of nutrients to plants; however rich substrates  
131 while benefiting plants also lead to high carbon and nitrogen leaching rates (Beecham and Razzaghmanesh,  
132 2015). Beyond nutrients, the risk of heavy metals release from substrates is increased in the presence of recycled  
133 materials such as broken tiles or bricks (Alsup et al., 2009). Substrate porosity affect substrate capacity to retain  
134 water as green roof manufactured substrates as pozzolan tend to be globally highly porous to gain lightness,  
135 while in natural soils the water retention is driven by the pore size distribution (Graceson et al., 2013). The intra-  
136 and inter-particle porosity are thus two important factors to be taken into account in order to promote water  
137 retention. Water retention also affects substrate temperature that can affect both plant root growth and  
138 functioning and building cooling. In this case, a more porous substrate likely leads to a better building cooling  
139 (Lin and Lin, 2011). However, as air is a better thermal insulator than water, a trade-off exists between the  
140 substrate overall porosity, substrate overall capacity to retain water, and irrigation frequencies. Efforts are  
141 currently being made on searching different alternatives to design substrates from key components to achieve  
142 desirable characteristics and thus better services. One example is the incorporation of substrate additives (e.g.  
143 seaweed) that can enhance water retention and sorption capacity, in particular for metal ions (Vijayaraghavan et  
144 al., 2015). Biochar addition in particular is viewed, and has been tested recently, as a mean to increase water  
145 holding capacity and plant available water without increasing substrate weight loading (Cao et al., 2014;  
146 Kuoppamäki and Lehvävirta, 2016) even if the properties of biochar can vary considerably (Kuoppamäki et al.,  
147 2016).

148 Second, substrate depth by increasing substrate volume could, in absolute, linearly increase the effects of  
149 substrate composition above-mentioned. The effects however are often unclear, perhaps due to the limited  
150 number of available studies, and to the fact that few studies have attempted to integrate several ecosystem

151 services simultaneously. Generally, deeper substrates favor plant growth and water retention (Nagase and  
152 Dunnett, 2010; Buccola and Spolek, 2010) even if they can be detrimental because of higher soil moisture to  
153 certain plant species such as stress tolerant species (Rowe, 2015). However, deeper substrates can lead to higher  
154 nitrogen and carbon leaching and thus decrease the quality of runoff water (Seidl et al., 2013), or have no effect  
155 (Razzaghmanesh et al., 2016) e.g. by lessening water leaching and increasing nitrogen and carbon holding  
156 (Vijayaraghavan, 2016). In the end, two mechanisms are confounded when depth of green roof's substrate is  
157 increased. The quantity of leachable material increases, but the larger water retention allows a longer presence  
158 within the substrate, which would favor a greater sorption by the substrate or a greater absorption by plants.

159

## 160 **5. Conclusion: what future researches on green roof substrates?**

161 Important gaps exist in the knowledge of the role of substrates on ecosystem services provided by green  
162 roofs. For instance, very few authors have studied the effect of substrate composition on evapotranspiration  
163 mechanisms. To our knowledge, no published study has evaluated the influence of substrate depth, substrate  
164 composition or the choice of plant species on air pollution, nor on the services of supports of biodiversity or  
165 pollination. No study ever projected to study the evolution of a substrate's diversity in terms of microorganisms  
166 e.g. the ones involved in the realization of the nitrogen cycle. This is of great importance as substrates, that differ  
167 from natural soils in their mineral composition but also in their organic compounds, can lead to particular  
168 abundances, activities and strategies (such as oligotrophic vs. copiotrophic) of microorganisms (Ditterich et al.,  
169 2016). Beyond studying the successions of microbial communities within substrates, the delivery of ecosystem  
170 services by green roofs could benefit from studies focusing on i) how exactly certain substrate components can  
171 modify microbial communities and functions (e.g. the addition of biochar can promote plant performance by  
172 increasing diversity and modifying metabolic potential in the rhizosphere microbiome – Kolton et al., 2017), and  
173 ii) how harsh environments as green roofs could be improved by manipulating microbial communities such as  
174 mycorrhizal fungi and microbial mixtures (Molineux et al., 2014; John et al., 2017).

175 Project managers as well as building owners indeed agree that there is a lack of tools to design and manage  
176 green roofs associated with "quality" ecosystem services. Studies that explicitly sought to evaluate the effect of  
177 vegetation type, composition, or substrate depth on ecosystem functions and services provided by green roofs are  
178 scarce (e.g. Graceson et al., 2014; Young et al., 2014; Aloisio et al., 2016; Eksi and Rowe, 2016; Ondoño et al.,  
179 2016). In relation to substrate (composition or depth combined), there are about fifteen studies concerning  
180 thermal services, about ten concerning the reduction of runoff, a dozen concerning water quality, only one

181 concerning the quality of air, none concerning other services. How can this low interest in the relationships  
182 between the components of a green roof and service levels be explained? A first explanation is the technical  
183 nature of green roofs. As mentioned above, the vast majority of commercialized green roofs are off-the-shelf  
184 systems, the design of which is highly standardized. This explains the homogeneity of systems throughout the  
185 world, and the scarcity of comparative studies. Moreover, the influence of the components of a green roof on the  
186 associated services is by essence multidisciplinary, and this also explains a part of the apparent scarcity of the  
187 specialized literature.

188 In the end, one of the main stumbling block is that the variable influence of certain components of green  
189 roofs on the expected services underlines the possibility of trade-offs between these services. In other words,  
190 optimizing a particular service is likely to reduce the level of another service. This possibility of compromise  
191 results mainly from the cycles of nutrients and water within a green roof. First and foremost, it is necessary to  
192 avoid as much as possible the flow of water in liquid form while promoting its evacuation in gaseous form *via*  
193 evapotranspiration. Second, it is necessary to facilitate the storage of carbon and nitrogen by plants and the  
194 substrate by limiting substrate leaching. Water cycle and nutrient cycle are intrinsically linked through different  
195 ecosystem functions. For example, transpiration depends on leaf area and the total biomass of the plants, which  
196 are themselves the result of the availability of nutrients, this ultimate being determined by the moisture of the  
197 substrate, conditioned by plant transpiration.

198 To better understand these trade-offs, while information on the links between components of a green roof  
199 substrate and the functions or services it fulfills remains fragmented, studies that have sought to cross just two of  
200 these components are rare. Until recently (Dusza et al., 2017), no study had evaluated the influence of  
201 interactions between substrate depth, substrate composition, and plant species on any of the functions or services  
202 of a green roof (Figure 1). In 2015, Lundholm was the first author to explicitly use the term “multifunctionality”  
203 in the context of green roofs. By observing how plant species, in monoculture or in combination of plants,  
204 simultaneously alter substrate temperature, retention and biomass production, Ludholm has established an index  
205 of multifunctionality representing an average of functions. Lundholm considered three types of treatment in  
206 relation to the desired services: the least and most effective for a given service, as well as those with the highest  
207 multifunctionality index. This approach is very innovative in the disciplinary field of green roofs and calls for  
208 more multifunctionality studies while we now know that substrate–plant interactions induce trade-offs between  
209 ecosystem functions, and that substrate type and depth interactions are major drivers for green roof  
210 multifunctionality (Dusza et al., 2017).



211

## 212 **Acknowledgements**

213 We would like to thank the Mission Economie de la Biodiversité of CDC-Biodiversité (Caisse des Dépôts  
214 group) and the City of Paris for funding. We would also like to thank an anonymous referee for his constructive  
215 comments on an earlier draft.

216

## 217 **References**

218 Aloisio, J.M., Tuininga, A.R., Lewis, J.D., 2016. Crop species selection effects on stormwater runoff and edible  
219 biomass in an agricultural green roof microcosm. *Ecological Engineering*, 88, 20–27.

220 Alsup, S., Ebbs, S., Retzlaff, W., 2009. The exchangeability and leachability of metals from select green roof  
221 growth substrates. *Urban Ecosystems*, 13, 91–111.

222 Ardakani, A., Yazdani, M., 2014. The relation between particle density and static elastic moduli of lightweight  
223 expanded clay aggregates. *Applied Clay Science*, 93–94, 28–34.

224 Beecham, S., Razzaghamanesh, M., 2015. Water quality and quantity investigation of green roofs in a dry  
225 climate. *Water Research*, 70, 370–384.

226 Berardi, U., GhaffarianHoseini, A., GhaffarianHoseini, A., 2014. State-of-the-art analysis of the environmental  
227 benefits of green roofs. *Applied Energy*, 115, 411–428.

228 Berretta, C., Poë, S., Stovin, V., 2014. Moisture content behaviour in extensive green roofs during dry periods:  
229 The influence of vegetation and substrate characteristics. *Journal of Hydrology*, 511, 374–386.

230 Best, B.B., Swadek, R.K., Burgess, T.L., 2015. Soil-Based Green Roofs. In: Sutton K.R. (eds) *Green Roof  
231 Ecosystems* (pp. 139–174). *Ecological Studies (Analysis and Synthesis)*, vol 223. Springer, Cham

232 Blank, L., Vasl, A., Levy, S., Grant, G., Kadas, G., Dafni, A., Blaustein, L., 2013. Directions in green roof  
233 research: A bibliometric study. *Building and Environment*, 66, 23–28.

234 Buccola, N., Spolek, G., 2010. A Pilot-Scale Evaluation of Greenroof Runoff Retention, Detention, and Quality.  
235 *Water, Air, Soil Pollution*, 216, 83–92.

236 Cao, J., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2013. Wind tunnel investigation of wind loads on rooftop model modules for  
237 green roofing systems, *Journal of Wind Engineering*, 118, 20–34.

238 Cao, C.T.N., Farrell, C., Kristiansen, P.E., Rayner, J.P., 2014. Biochar makes green roof substrates lighter and  
239 improves water supply to plants. *Ecological Engineering*, 71, 368–374.

240 Chambers, F.M., Beilman, D.W., Yu Z., 2010. Methods for determining peat humification and for quantifying  
241 peat bulk density, organic matter and carbon content for palaeostudies of climate and peatland carbon  
242 dynamic. *Mires and Peat*, 7, 1-10.

243 CSTB, 2008. Centre Scientifique et technique du bâtiment, Toitures végétalisées : une contribution au  
244 développement durable. [http://www.cstb.fr/archives/webzines/editions/19-fevrier-2008/toitures-vegetalisees-  
245 une-contribution-au-developpement-durable.html](http://www.cstb.fr/archives/webzines/editions/19-fevrier-2008/toitures-vegetalisees-une-contribution-au-developpement-durable.html).

246 Ditterich, F., Poll, C., Pronk, G.J., Heister, K., Chandran, A., Rennert, T., Kögel-Knabner, I., Kandeler, E., 2016.  
247 Succession of soil microbial communities and enzyme activities in artificial soils. *Pedobiologia*, 59, 93–104.

248 Dunnett, N., Kingsburry, N., 2008. *Planting green roofs and living walls*. Timber Press Portland, London, 328pp.

249 Durhman, A.K., Rowe, D.B., Building, S., Lansing, E., Rugh, C.L., 2007. Effect of substrate depth on initial  
250 growth, coverage, and survival of 25 succulent green roof plant taxa. *HortScience*, 42, 588–595.

251 Dusza, Y., 2017. Green roofs and ecosystem services: enhancing multifunctionality through soil-plant  
252 interactions and plant diversity. PhD Thesis, University of Pierre and Marie Curie UPMC, Paris, France.

253 Dusza, Y., Pacteau, C., Abbadie, L., 2015. Toitures végétalisées et services écosystémiques : vers des toitures-  
254 écosystèmes (p. 117-202), in "Toit urbain : les défis énergétiques et écosystémiques d'un nouveau territoire"  
255 (Dir. Prochazka, A., Breux, S., Griffith, C., Boyer- Mercier, P.), Presses universitaires de Laval, 396 pp.

256 Dusza, Y., Barot, S., Kraepiel, Y., Lata, J-C., Abbadie, L., Raynaud, X., 2017. Multifunctionality is affected by  
257 interactions between green roof plant species, substrate depth, and substrate type. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7,  
258 2357–2369.

259 Eksi, M., Rowe, D.B., 2016. Green roof substrates: Effect of recycled crushed porcelain and foamed glass on  
260 plant growth and water retention. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 20, 81–88.

261 FLL, 2010. Forschungsgesellschaft Landschaftsentwicklung Landschaftsbau (Landscape, Research,  
262 Development and Construction Society). *Guideline for the Planning, Execution, and upkeep of green-roof  
263 Sites*. [www.f-l-l.de](http://www.f-l-l.de).

264 Graceson, A., Hare, M., Monaghan, J., Hall, N., 2013. The water retention capabilities of growing media for  
265 green roofs. *Ecological Engineering*, 61, 328–334.

266 Graceson, A., Monaghan, J., Hall, N., Hare, M., 2014. Plant growth responses to different growing media for  
267 green roofs. *Ecological Engineering*, 69, 196–200.

268 Graceson, A., Hare, M., Hall, N., Monaghan, J., 2014. Use of inorganic substrates and composted green waste in  
269 growing media for green roofs. *Biosystems Engineering*, 124, 1–7.

270 John, J., Kernaghan, G., Lundholm, J., 2017. The potential for mycorrhizae to improve green roof function.  
271 Urban ecosystems, 20, 113–127.

272 Kolton, M., Graber, E.R., Tsehansky, L., Elad, Y., Cytryn, E., 2017. Biochar-stimulated plant performance is  
273 strongly linked to microbial diversity and metabolic potential in the rhizosphere. *New Phytologist*, 213,  
274 1393–1404.

275 Kuoppamäki, K., Lehvävirta, S., 2016. Mitigating nutrient leaching from green roofs with biochar. *Landscape  
276 and Urban Planning*, 152, 39–48.

277 Kuoppamäki, K., Hagner, M., Lehvävirta, S., Setälä, H., 2016. Biochar amendment in the green roof substrate  
278 affects runoff quality and quantity. *Ecological Engineering*, 88, 1–9.

279 Lee, K.E., Williams, K.J.H., Sargent, L.D., Williams, N.S.G., Johnson, K.A., 2015. 40-second green roof views  
280 sustain attention: The role of micro-breaks in attention restoration. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 42,  
281 182–189.

282 Lin, Y.-J., Lin, H.-T., 2011. Thermal performance of different planting substrates and irrigation frequencies in  
283 extensive tropical rooftop greeneries. *Building and Environment*, 46, 345–355.

284 Lundholm, J.T., 2015. Green roof plant species diversity improves ecosystem multifunctionality. *Journal of  
285 Applied Ecology*, 52, 726–734.

286 Massazza, F., 1998. Pozzolana and Pozzolonaic cements (471–635) in *Lea's Chemistry of Cement and Concrete  
287 (Fourth Edition)*, edited by Peter C. Hewlett, Oxford, (U-K), 1057 pp.

288 Millenium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis*. Island Press,  
289 Washington, DC.

290 Molineux, C.J., Connop, S.P., Gange, A.C., 2014. Manipulating soil microbial communities in extensive green  
291 roof substrates. *Science of the Total Environment*, 493, 632–638.

292 Nagase, A., Dunnett, N., 2010. Drought tolerance in different vegetation types for extensive green roofs: Effects  
293 of watering and diversity. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 97, 318–327.

294 Nagase, A., Dunnett, N., 2011. The relationship between percentage of organic matter in substrate and plant  
295 growth in extensive green roofs. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 103, 230–236.

296 Nardini, A., Andri, S., Crasso, M., 2011. Influence of substrate depth and vegetation type on temperature and  
297 water runoff mitigation by extensive green roofs: shrubs versus herbaceous plants. *Urban Ecosystems*, 15,  
298 697–708.

299 Oberndorfer, E., Lundholm, J., Bass, B., Coffman, R.R., Doshi, H., Dunnett, N., Gaffin, S., Köhler, M., Liu,  
300 K.K.Y., Rowe, B., 2007. Green roofs as urban ecosystems: Ecological structures, functions, and services.  
301 BioScience, 57, 823–833.

302 Ondoño, S., Martínez-Sánchez, J.J., Moreno, J.L., 2015. Evaluating the growth of several Mediterranean  
303 endemic species in artificial substrates: Are these species suitable for their future use in green roofs?  
304 Ecological Engineering, 81, 405–417.

305 Ondoño, S., Martínez-Sánchez, J.J., Moreno, J.L., 2016. The composition and depth of green roof substrates  
306 affect the growth of *Silene vulgaris* and *Lagurus ovatus* species and the C and N sequestration under two  
307 irrigation conditions. Journal of environmental management, 166, 330–340.

308 Razzaghamanesh, M., Beecham, S., Salemi, T., 2016. The role of green roofs in mitigating Urban Heat Island  
309 effects in the metropolitan area of Adelaide Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 15, 89–102.

310 Rowe, D.B., Monterusso, M.A., Rugh, C.L., 2006. Assessment of heat-expanded slate and fertility requirements  
311 in green roof substrates. HortTechnology, 16, 471–477.

312 Rowe, B., 2015. Long-term Rooftop Plant Communities. In: Sutton K.R. (eds) Green Roof Ecosystems (pp. 311–  
313 332). Ecological Studies (Analysis and Synthesis), vol 223. Springer, Cham

314 Sayed, O.H., 2001. Crassulacean Acid Metabolism 1975–2000, a checklist. Photosynthetica, 39, 339–352.

315 Seidl, M., Gromaire, M.C., Saad, M., De Gouvello, B., 2013. Effect of substrate depth and rain-event history on  
316 the pollutant abatement of green roofs. Environmental Pollution, 183, 195–203.

317 Sutton, K.R., 2015. Green Roof Ecosystems. Ecological Studies 223, Springer International Publishing  
318 Switzerland (K.R. Sutton, ed.), doi:10.1007/978-3-319-14983-7\_1.

319 Ting, I.P., 1985. Crassulacean acid metabolism. Annual review of plant physiology, 36, 595- 622.

320 Vijayaraghavan, K., 2016. Green roofs: A critical review on the role of components, benefits, limitations and  
321 trends. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 57, 740–752.

322 Vijayaraghavan, K., Raja, F.D., 2014. Design and development of green roof substrate to improve runoff water  
323 quality: Plant growth experiments and adsorption. Water Research, 63, 94–101.

324 Vijayaraghavan, K., Joshi, U.M., 2015. Application of seaweed as substrate additive in green roofs:  
325 Enhancement of water retention and sorption capacity. Landscape and Urban Planning, 143, 25–32.


326 Young, T., Cameron, D.D., Sorrill, J., Edwards, T., Phoenix, G.K., 2014. Importance of different components of  
327 green roof substrate on plant growth and physiological performance. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 13,  
328 507–516.

329

330 **Table 1**  
 331 Ecosystem services associated with green roofs (Dusza, 2017).

Service category	Expected services of green roofs
<b>Regulation</b> (City scale)	Fighting urban heat island effects Reduction of rainwater run-off Improved water and air quality Carbon storage
<b>Regulation</b> (Building scale)	Thermal protection of building Protection of waterproofing membranes Sound protection
<b>Support</b>	Support of biodiversity Pollination
<b>Production</b>	Urban Agriculture
<b>Cultural</b>	Aesthetics Psychological services (resistance to stress, attention restoration)

332  
 333 **Fig. 1.**  
 334 Experimental green roof in Paris City, France, manipulating substrate type, substrate depth and plant diversity ©  
 335 Yann Dusza 2016



336